DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 743

UD 007 445

By-Donovan, Bernard E.
Summary of Proposed Programs 1967-68 Title I--Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
Spons Agency-New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Pub Date 30 Aug 67
Note-124p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.30
Descriptors-Boards of Education, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Programs, *Federal Programs, Program Budgeting, Program Descriptions, Program Evaluation, *Project Applications, School Superintendents, *Urban Schools
Identifiers-Center for Urban Education, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title 1, ESEA Title 1, New York City

The document presents the recommendations of the Superintendent of Schools of New York City to the Board of Education for programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title I, during 1967-1968. Briefly described are 22 proposed projects, including budget estimates. Also included are summaries of the evaluations by the Center for Urban Education of ESEA programs in operation during 1966-1967. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ED0 24743

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

07445E

Summary of Proposed Programs

1967-68

Title I — Elementary and Secondary Education Act

UD 007 445

Submitted to the Board of Education
by
Dr. Bernard E. Donovan
Superintendent of Schools

In Connection With a Public Hearing to Be Held in the
Hall of the Board of Education
110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, New York

August 30, 1967
9:30 a.m.

PROGRAMS FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 1967 - 1968 (September 1967 to June 1968) UNDER THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

I. INTRODUCTION

The development of these programs for educationally deprived children under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 represents a cooperative effort involving dozens of meetings and hundreds of individuals and groups over a period of more than six months. For example, changes in the criteria for eligibility of pupils were discussed at great length at meetings of the Standing Committee for Title I and with officials of the non-public schools; with the Education Committee of the Council Against Poverty; with Local School Board representatives; and at a public meeting to which were invited civic and community groups interested in education. A similar series of meetings was held in connection with the development of programs.

The New York City Council Against Proverty has a specific function under the law. Every effort has been made to reach agreement with the representatives of the Council, keeping in mind that the final responsibility rests with the Board of Education. Many changes have been made in keeping with its recommendations.

Staff work has already begun with a view to even closer cooperation with reference to programs for the summer of 1968 and for the school year 1968-1969. A timetable is being established to permit timely consideration, discussion, and adoption of new proposals with adequate allowance for logistical and organizational problems.

It must be clearly understood that these present proposals submitted by the Superintendent of Schools are tentative and subject to change. They are simply the recommendations of the Superintendent of Schools to the Board of Education. The Board has indicated that it is eager to secure public reaction to all proposals.

II. CRITERIA FOR ESEA TITLE I ELIGIBILITY

Recent guidelines issued by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare require basic changes in the present criteria for the selection of pupils and schools under ESEA Title I. In keeping with these changed guidelines, criteria for eligibility of schools are to be established as follows:

A. Pupils attending schools, both public and non-public, located in poverty areas designated by the Council Against Poverty will be eligible for ESEA Title I services if 50% or more of the pupils in these schools reside within the designated poverty areas.

B. Pupils attending schools, both public and non-public, located outside poverty areas designated by the Council Against Poverty will be eligible for ESEA Title I services if 50% or more of the pupils in these schools reside within the designated poverty areas, and if the distance from the poverty area does not exceed the following:

1. High Schools - One mile.
2. Other Schools - Three short blocks, or one long block (approximately 750 feet).

C. Pupils who live in poverty areas designated by the Council Against Poverty but who elect to attend schools outside the poverty areas under an officially sponsored program of integration will be eligible for ESEA Title I services.

D. 1. Pupils in school attendance areas outside the designated poverty areas will be eligible for ESEA Title I services if:

(a) The median retardation in reading is:

(1) One year or more in grade 5 of elementary school.

(2) Two years or more in grade 8 of intermediate or junior high school.

(3) Two years or more in the entering class of high school;

AND

(b) 30% or more of the pupils in the school are eligible for free lunch.

2. Pupils attending non-public schools located in the school attendance areas of public schools designated in accordance with D1, above, will be eligible under the same conditions as those indicated in D1 (a) and D1 (b).

E. The following additional facts are important:

1. The mere fact of eligibility for service does not necessarily entitle pupils in a school to service. Such factors as availability of funds and extent of educational deprivation or handicap must also be taken into account.

2. There should be a reasonable relationship between the nature and extent of the services supplied and the nature and extent of the needs.

3. A listing has been developed containing all the addresses within the poverty areas designated by the Council Against Poverty. The Board of Education has raised some questions concerning the accuracy of these designations by the Council. There will probably be some changes.

4. It will be assumed that a school physically located within a designated poverty area is composed of a majority of pupils from within the designated poverty area. On the basis of this assumption, services will be supplied to such schools upon the opening of school in September, or shortly thereafter. However, such services will not be continued beyond September 30, if eligibility is not established.

5. Additional schools may be declared eligible when and if they submit verifying data.

6. On the basis of existing data it appears likely that public schools will qualify in the following numbers:

	Within Poverty Area	Outside Poverty Area	Total
Elementary	288	18	306
Int. or Jr. H.S.	70	5	75
Academic H.S.	15	9	24
Vocational H.S.	12	9	21
	385	41	426

7. On the basis of existing data, 184 non-public elementary schools are located in poverty areas and will be eligible for assistance as of the opening of school in September. However, the continuance of assistance is dependent upon the meeting of eligibility requirements by September 30, 1967.

   In addition, three non-public elementary schools located within 750 feet of a poverty area have filed the necessary data for inclusion.

III. ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS FOR 1967-1968

A. General Considerations

Present guidelines under ESEA Title I make it clear that funds must be used for educationally deprived children and not for the general support of all schools. Therefore, only children in eligible schools, as indicated in Section II above, will receive assistance, or children who are eligible by virtue of residence and who chose instead to attend another school under an officially sponsored program of integration.

During the past two years, the bulk of the Title I funds used to supply additional services to pupils in "Special Service" schools have been incorporated as an integral part of the total school program. These additional services included reading teachers, guidance counselors, smaller class size, and the like. However, because they were completely interlocked with the normal school program, they were sometimes difficult to identify clearly as Title I services, and often difficult to evaluate properly.

It is intended for the future to fund under ESEA Title I, so far as possible, only those programs which are independently visible and which can be evaluated as separate entities. For example, the 1966-1967 Title I budget for general additions to schools included the following items in the category of interlocking additional services to schools with large numbers of poverty children:

1. Elementary Schools

services to special service schools	$ 7,529,000	
services to transitional schools	4,905,000	
services to Open Enrollment schools	3,467,000	
	$ 15,901,000	$15,901,000

2. Intermediate and Junior High Schools

services to special service schools	$ 1,850,000	
services to transitional schools	2,791,000	
services to Open Enrollment schools	1,983,000	
services to middle schools	4,647,000	
	$ 11,271,000	11,271,000

3. High Schools

services to academic high schools	$ 6,172,000	
services to vocational high schools	2,937,000	
	$ 9,109,000	9,109,000

4. Special Schools and Atypical Children

services to schools for socially maladjusted	$ 2,279,000	
supportive services	744,000	
services to child caring schools	410,000	
	$ 3,433,000	3,433,000
		$39,714,000

Thus, last year (1966-1967) $39,714,000 was budgeted for such items—almost two-thirds of the budget exclusive of summer programs. For this year, (1967-1968), it is planned to include only $16,302,000 for such items.

Next year (1968-1969), it is planned to transfer all such expenditures to the regular school budget, and to include them in the tax levy budget estimates for 1968-1969.

B. Priorities

In the development of programs for 1967-1968, the staff has kept in mind the following priorities established by the Board of Education:

1. Programs for early childhood education
2. Programs for academic improvement, with emphasis on reading and other basic skills
3. Programs involving a decentralized approach to budgeting and programming
4. Development of a career ladder for non-professionals with emphasis on careers in education for people from the community
5. Programs fostering community involvement in the schools
6. Teacher training and re-training, in the light of the priorities noted above

These priorities parallel closely those which have been developed by the Council Against Poverty, and reflect the results of our discussions.

C. Funding

The Congress has not yet appropriated funds for 1967-1968 under ESEA Title I. It appears likely however that New York City will receive approximately as much money as it did for 1966-1967, or $69,870,000 and the budget for 1967-1968 is based on that assumption.

D. Recommended Programs for 1967-1968

The programs recommended for 1967-1968 are described in the accompanying pages in sufficient detail to permit public discussion. Upon adoption by the Board of Education, the approved programs will be prepared in detail on the appropriate State and Federal forms and will be transmitted to the agencies which must approve them. Copies of these final and detailed forms will be available for public inspection in the Library of the Board of Education.

ESEA TITLE 1 RECOMMENDED PROGRAMS FOR 1967-1968

		Amount
1. Compensatory Educational and Supportive Services for Pupils in Poverty Area Schools		$14,752,000
a. Elementary Schools	$ 3,946,000	
b. Intermediate and Junior High Schools	4,876,000	
c. Academic High Schools	3,583,000	
d. Vocational High Schools	2,347,000	

In general, there will be no diminution of services to schools aided during 1966-67. Some services formerly supplied with Title I funds will be supplied instead with tax levy funds. The Title I funds thus freed will be used for direct and additional services to pupils.

	Amount
2. Improving Instruction and Services in Schools for Socially Maladjusted Children	$ 1,550,000

This sum does not include supportive services for socially maladjusted pupils in regular schools, which will be included in items 1a and 1b above.

The Education Committee of the Council Against Poverty has recommended that $100,000 be used to study possible alternative programs. The Superintendent's Committee on the Disruptive Child is now in the process of making recommendations. These recommendations will be studied and the alternative solutions discussed with the Council Against Poverty and other groups.

	Amount
3. More Effective Schools	$ 8,595,000

The additional expenditures beyond normal costs for all More Effective Schools in poverty areas will come from Title I; for schools outside poverty areas, from tax levy funds.

		Amount
4. Services to Children in Open Enrollment Receiving Schools		$ 3,470,000
a. Elementary Schools	$ 953,000	
b. Intermediate and Junior High Schools	797,000	
c. Academic High Schools (See note following item 1 above.)	1,720,000	

Additional services will also be supplied through a $1,000,000 State allocation and with tax levy funds.

5. A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools		$10,394,000
a. Educational Assistant or Teacher Aide for each kindergarten teacher	$ 2,807,000	
b. Teachers to help reduce the teacher-pupil ratio in grade 1 to 1-15 (227 teachers)	1,250,000	
c. Teachers to reduce the teacher-pupil ratio in grade 2 to 1-20 (620 teachers)	3,410,000	
d. Additional allocations for materials - grades 1-2	790,000	
e. Diagnosis and special instruction in reading	660,000	
f. Parental Involvement in the reading improvement program	267,000	
g. Fringe Benefits	1,210,000	

In grade 1, 1,223 additional positions will be supplied through tax levy funds.

6. Decentralized Programs		$10,580,000

For these programs, the legal mandate of the Board of Education to consult with the Council Against Poverty is transferred to the District Superintendent with instructions that he confer with the local Community Action Agency.

The total sum listed is to be expended as follows:

a. District Decentralized Title I ESEA Programs

$5,000,000 will be allocated to District Superintendents, with the sum to each Superintendent proportional to the number of school children in poverty areas in his district. The priorities and objectives established by the Board of Education are to be kept in mind in the establishment of these district programs.

b. Educational Facilities for Pregnant School-Age Girls

$500,000 will be allocated to a central fund for programs for the education of pregnant school-age girls, to be matched from district funds, so that a total of $1,000,000 will be available.

c. Special Program: Benjamin Franklin H.S., Columbia University and the Urban League

$104,750 will be allocated to a central fund for programs at Benjamin Franklin involving Columbia University and the Urban League, to be matched from district funds so that a a total of $209,500 will be available.

d. Academic Excellence in an Inner City Elementary School - P.S. 129K

$50,000 will be allocated to a central fund for a program at P.S. 129 Brooklyn, involving Yeshiva University, to be matched from district funds so that a total of $100,000 will be available.

e. Special Primary Program - 5 Schools

$425,000 will be allocated to a central fund for special primary programs at five schools, to be matched from district funds, so that a total of $850,000 will be available.

f. Teacher Training and Reading Institutes in Poverty Area School Districts

$1,000,000 will be available for teacher training and retraining.

g. After School Study Centers

At the elementary, intermediate and junior high school levels, $3,500,000 will be available for after school activities aimed primarily at academic improvement. It will be distributed on the same basis as indicated in "a" above. In the project proposal a typical center is described with a cost factor for each component: basic structure, Negro and Puerto Rican history and culture, Homework Helper, gifted, art, music, etc. Each district superintendent after consultation with the local Community Action Agency and other groups in the community, will decide among various alternatives:

-- keep the Center as it was last year.

-- add or subtract various components.

-- create new alternatives, keeping in mind the prime objective of academic improvement for the pupils of the district.

To this total decentralized allocation of $10,580,000 should be added two items already included above - $660,000 for parental involvement in the early childhood reading improvement program and $267,000 for diagnosis and special instruction in reading. Thus, the total amount for such programs is really $11,507,000.

	Amount
7. A Program For The Recruitment, Training And Employment Of Auxiliary Non-Professional Neighborhood Personnel For Careers In The N.Y.C. Schools	$ 750,000

The total amount to be expended in these programs by the Board of Education alone approaches the $5,000,000 suggested by the Education Committee of the Council Against Poverty. It exceeds this sum if the proposals of the Human Resources Administration, in cooperation with the Board, are included.

The program will commence with the 1967-1968 school year and will involve a minimum of 2,432 non-professional positions derived from the following funding sources:

a. 250 Scheuer Trainee Slots

b. 1000 Neighborhood Youth Corps Trainee Slots

c. 1182 Positions created by the Board of Education utilizing funds from Title I, ESEA

d. Aides for Title I teachers in non-public schools

Sources of Funds

Board of Education (Title I, ESEA)

Career and Training Program	$ 750,000
Aides for Non-Public Schools (See item 21, below)	50,000
Aides or Assistants for 1182 Kindergarten Positions (See item 5a, above)	2,807,000
Total (Board of Education Contribution)	$3,607,000

		Amount
Human Resources Administration		
Cost for training one trainee- $750 (750 x 1,000 Neighborhood Youth Corps & Trainees)	$ 750,000	
$750 x 250 Scheuer Trainees	187,500	
Total (Training Costs, H.R.A.)	$ 937,500	
Stipend for one Neighborhood Corps Trainee- $1,890 ($45 per week x 42 wks.) = $1,890 x 1,000 trainees	1,890,000	
Stipend for one Scheuer Trainee- $2,730 ($65 per week x 42 wks.) = $2,730 x 250 Scheuer Trainees	682,500	
Total (Human Resources Administration Training Costs)	$3,510,000	
Grand Total		$7,117,000

With this proposal the Board of Education commits itself to the establishment of positions for the 1250 people to be trained during the 1967-68 school year by funds of the Human Resources Administration.

This sum does not include an additional $900,000, pledged by the Human Resources Administration to cover college tuition and supportive guidance services for Educational Assistants hired in the 1967-1968 program who are accepted for college enrollment.

8. School-University Teacher Education Center (SUTEC)	$ 200,000
9. Improving the Teaching of English as a Second Language in Grades K-6	$ 1,000,000

The tentative allocation for this purpose was $550,000. The Education Committee of the Council Against Poverty has recommended

Amount

that this sum be increased to $2,000,000 in order to hire Spanish speaking teachers and to prepare them to pass certification examinations. The objectives are fully acceptable but the details remain to be worked out. The allocation has therefore been increased to $1,000,000 with $450,000 reserved until a plan has been formulated. To the extent possible, as plans are developed, this sum may be increased.

10. College Discovery and Development Program — $1,182,000

11. College Bound — $2,876,000

12. Educational Services for Pupils in Child Caring Institutions for the Neglected and Delinquent — $ 500,000

13. Pre-Kindergarten Classes in Poverty Areas — $4,100,000

The Superintendent of Schools has recommended to the Board of Education that:

a. All pupils trained in Headstart or Early Childhood Development Centers and who qualify for admission to kindergarten by virtue of age must be accepted for placement in kindergarten.

b. A pre-kindergarten class should not be organized in a school when there will be a sufficient number of kindergarten children on a waiting list in that school to organize a class. In short, pre-kindergarten space will not be allocated until kindergarten children are served.

As a result, it is estimated that the number of pre-kindergarten classes will be reduced to 266 (exclusive of those in M.E. Schools) as compared to 304 in June 1967. These actions reflect the recommendations of the Council Against Poverty.

14. Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Non-Public Schools — $ 900,000

		Amount
15. Corrective Mathematics Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Non-Public Schools		$ 775,000
16. Guidance in Non-Public Schools		$ 950,000
17. Speech Therapy for Disadvantaged Non-Public School Pupils		$ 258,000
18. Educational Field Trips for Non-Public School Pupils		$ 112,000
19. Achievement Tests in Reading and Mathematics for Disadvantaged Pupils in Non-Public Schools		$ 61,000
20. Programs for Handicapped Children in Non-Public Schools		$ 150,000
21. Aides for Title I Teachers in Non-Public Schools		$ 50,000
22. Program for Pupils in Non-Public Schools Learning English as a Second Language		$ 109,000
23. Reserves for Central Budgets		$ 2,450,000
a. Business Administration	$ 1,250,000	
b. Research and Evaluation	1,000,000	
c. Coordination, Non-Public Schools	200,000	
24. Other Reserves		$4,106,000
a. Contractual Salary Increases	3,000,000	
b. Summer Programs*	1,106,000	
Grand Total		$69,870,000

* Additional programs for the summer of 1968 will be funded from accruals. During the 1966-1967 year, such accruals exceeded $9,000,000.

IV. EVALUATION

With reference to ESEA Title I funds, the Board of Education has accepted the thesis that its staff ought not to evaluate its own programs. Therefore, it has in the past contracted with the Center for Urban Education, one of the regional laboratories established under Title IV of ESEA, to evaluate the great majority of New York City programs under ESEA Title I.

The evaluation process has not been working as well as it might, and it is apparent that some changes should be made.

The contract with the Center for Urban Education has called for reports to be delivered by August 31 following the end of the school year during which the projects took place. This timing did not permit adequate information to be available for the improvement of existing programs and the construction of new programs, before the September school opening date.

This year, for example, interim evaluations became available in the Spring. However, they were perforce so general in nature that they had relatively limited usefulness. The summaries of the full evaluations of some of the projects were not delivered until the week of August 7, and the remainder will be forthcoming at intervals during the next week or two. None of the full evaluations have as yet been received.

These summaries, containing the major findings and recommendations will be released to the public as they are received. Some of them accompany this material, in the Appendix. The Board has always made these evaluation materials available to the public as rapidly as possible, and will continue to do so.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, the Superintendent of Schools is grateful to the Center for Urban Education for its cooperation in making these summaries available at an earlier date.

A number of programs are recommended for re-cycling for 1967-1968. Using available data from previous years, it may be possible to secure the results of evaluation well before the beginning of the new school year.

At the same time, there are some new and innovative programs which necessarily cannot be properly evaluated in a brief time. For example, the new College Bound program will, it is hoped, continue for many years. It may be possible to contract for an independent interim evaluation, to be delivered in February or March, to serve as a basis for improvement. A full report to be issued later some time after June 30 to permit fuller investigation and mature deliberation would serve as a basis for decisions to be reached for the following September, or possibly earlier.

Many variations are of course possible. It is intended to explore this question with the Council Against Poverty, with parent, educational and community groups, with Local School Boards and with non-public school officials in the attempt to reach the wisest solution.

A second area of concern relates to the need for outside independent assistance to help us evaluate the most fundamental aspects of the total Title I program. It is intended to seek this help in answering such basic questions as the following:

--- Have funds been used in keeping with the intent of the act?
--- Has there been sufficient concentration of effort to secure reasonable results?
--- What alternatives exist for expenditures, and what are the likely results of the adoption of these alternatives?
--- To what extent have Title I funds been used to expand successful innovative designs and programs?
--- To what extent have Title I funds been utilized in keeping with announced objectives and priorities of the school system?

A third question relates to the use of only one outside evaluative agency to conduct these studies. There may be advantages to enlisting the assistance of more than one qualified agency or institution. The Council Against Poverty has made suggestions to this point.

It is also possible that other less formal evaluations should be included as part of the total evaluation. These suggestions and others will be explored fully, in consultation with the Council Against Poverty and other groups.

1. PROJECT TITLE: COMPENSATORY EDUCATIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR PUPILS IN POVERTY AREA SCHOOLS

1.a. PROJECT TITLE: COMPENSATORY EDUCATIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR PUPILS IN POVERTY AREA ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

It is proposed to provide children attending elementary schools in poverty areas with a range of compensatory services designed to combat the effects of economic and educational disadvantage. The basic objectives of this program are the improvement of:

- classroom performance in academic skills
- attitudes toward school
- emotional and social stability

The priorities arising out of these objectives and governing the assignment of this supplementary service will dictate that:

1. Services funded will be those which impinge directly rather than indirectly upon children.

2. The primary emphasis will be on the improvement of children's functioning in academic areas.

3. Special services designed to meet special and distinctive needs of children in these schools will be provided.

In the elementary schools located within the poverty areas designated by the Council Against Poverty, Title I will fund a number of supplementary services.

Teachers of corrective reading will provide intensive instruction designed to improve children's basic reading skills. Teachers will be provided to lower class size so that a greater degreee of individualization of instruction is made possible. Teachers will be provided for the special classes known as Junior Guidance Classes, organized to provide a special school environment for emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted children who could otherwise not be maintained in the school setting. Teachers trained in the teaching of English as a second language will be provided to help youngsters in this category. Additional library and enrichment teachers will strengthen programs in the reading and in cultural areas.

Supportive personnel including guidance counselors, social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists will provide intensive services to children and their families designed to remove obstacles to learning and to bring about improved personal adjustment.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Instruction

42 Teachers for reduced class size at $7,760*	$ 326,000
29 Teachers in the N.E. Program at $7,290*	211,000
58 Teachers for remedial work at $13,440*	780,000
42 Teachers for enrichment at $11,050*	464,000
83 Teachers of special classes (Junior Guidance) at $10,700*	888,000
18 Teachers of Library at $12,100*	218,000

Supportive Services

8 Social Workers at $11,738*		94,000
6 Psychologists at $11,738*		70,000
5-1/2 Part-time Psychiatrists at $13,875*		77,000
50 Guidance Counselors at $14,500*		725,000
	Total	$3,853,000
Supplies		93,000
	Grand Total	$3,946,000

* Includes Fringe Benefits

1.b. PROJECT TITLE: COMPENSATORY EDUCATIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR PUPILS IN POVERTY AREA JUNIOR HIGH AND INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

It is proposed to provide children attending junior high and intermediate schools in poverty areas designated by the Council Against Poverty with a range of compensatory services designed to combat the effects of economic deprivation and educational disadvantage. The basic objectives of this program are the improvement of:

- classroom performance in academic skills
- attitudes toward school
- emotional and social stability

The priorities arising out of these objectives and governing the assignment of this supplementary service will dictate that:

1. Services funded will be those which impinge directly rather than indirectly upon children.

2. The primary emphasis should be on the improvement of children's functioning in academic areas.

3. Special services designed to meet special and distinctive needs of children in these schools should be provided.

Title I will fund the following supplementary services:

Teachers will be provided to work intensively with small groups of children on the improvement of their reading skills. Other teachers will be provided to reduce class size so that pupils may be assured a greater share of the teacher's individual attention. Teaching personnel for 2 types of special classes will be provided. Career Guidance Classes are designed to provide a special program for older youngsters who may be potential dropouts, featuring a special curriculum, very small classes, part-time work experiences and intensive counseling. Special Guidance classes are established to service the emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted youngster whose acting-out behavior pattern requires small group instruction and intensive counseling service. Librarians, school secretaries, laboratory assistants and assistant principals will be added to strengthen the school's program.

A special allocation for supplementary instructional supplies is also provided for these schools. The range of supportive services includes guidance counselors, social workers and psychiatric service.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Instruction		
77 Teachers to reduce class size at $9,130*		$ 703,000
8 Teachers for remedial work at $8,100*		65,000
118 Teachers of special classes at $9,720* (Career Guidance, Special Guidance)		1,147,000
82 Assistant Principals at $13,940*		1,144,000
50 Secretaries at $6,170*		309,000
50 Laboratory Assistants at $5,680*		284,000
43 Librarians at $9,100*		391,000
Supportive Services		
2 Social Workers at $11,738*		23,000
1 Part-time Psychiatrist at $13,875*		14,000
22 Guidance Counselors at $14,750*		325,000
		$4,406,000
62,062 school aide hours* at $2.13		132,000
Supplies		339,000
	Total	$4,876,000

* Includes fringe benefits

1.c. PROJECT TITLE: COMPENSATORY EDUCATION AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR STUDENTS IN POVERTY AREA ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

It is proposed to provide students attending academic high schools in poverty areas designated by the Council Against Poverty with a range of compensatory services designed to combat the effects of economic deprivation and educational disadvantage. The basic objectives of this program are the improvement of:

- classroom performance in academic skills
- attitudes toward school
- emotional and social stability

The priorities arising out of these objectives and governing the assignment of this supplementary service will dictate that:

1. Services funded will be those which impinge directly rather than indirectly upon students.

2. The primary emphasis should be on the improvement of students' functioning in academic areas.

3. Special services designed to meet special and distinctive needs of students in these schools should be provided.

The supplementary services provided for the children in these schools include the following areas:

Class size: Additional teachers will be provided to reduce class size so pupils may benefit from a greater share of the teacher's attention.

Remediation: Additional teachers will be provided so that small groups may be formed for the improvement of academic skills in English, reading and mathematics.

English: Additional teachers will be provided so that pupils for whom English is a second language may be serviced.

Counseling: Additional teachers will be provided so that pupils may benefit from individual counseling in the areas of behavior guidance and health.

Administration: Additional teachers and secretaries will be provided to facilitate the implementation of school activities (G.O., publications, etc.)

Library: Additional teachers of library will be provided to better service pupils in the development of work-study skills and desirable reading habits.

Science: Additional laboratory assistants will be provided to strengthen the science program and to provide individual attention.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

232 Teachers at $10,600		$2,958,598*
31 Secretaries at $6,000		227,553*
16 Lab. Assistants at $6,000		109,421*
7 Guidance Counselors at $12,200		106,750*
22,310 School Aide Hours at $2.13		47,520*
Supplies		133,629
	Total	$3,583,471

* These totals include fringe benefits

1.d. PROJECT TITLE: COMPENSATORY EDUCATION AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN POVERTY AREAS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

It is proposed to provide poverty area students attending vocational high schools with a range of compensatory services designed to combat the effects of economic deprivation and educational disadvantage. The basic objectives of this program are the improvement of:

- classroom performance in academic skills
- attitudes toward school
- emotional and social stability

The priorities arising out of these objectives and governing the assignment of this supplementary service will dictate that:

1. Services funded will be those which impinge directly rather than indirectly upon students.
2. The primary emphasis should be on the improvement of students' functioning in academic areas.
3. Special services designed to meet special and distinctive needs of students in these schools should be provided.

The supplementary services provided for the children in these schools include the following areas:

Library: Additional teachers of library will be provided in order to better service students in the acquisition of desirable work study and reading habits.

Remediation: Additional teachers will be provided to make possible the formation of small groups for the improvement of reading skills.

Counseling: Additional teachers will be provided so that pupils may benefit from individual counseling in educational and vocational guidance.

Instruction: Additional teachers and supervisors will be provided to strengthen the instructional program in specialized subject areas.

Science: Additional laboratory assistants will be provided to strengthen the science program and to provide individual attention.

Chairman: Additional chairmen will be added to improve supervision of instruction.

Secretary: Additional secretaries will be provided to supply clerical services for the school program.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

171 Teachers at $12,740*		$2,178,540
8 Secretaries at $7,340*		58,720
4 Lab. Assistants at $6,840*		27,360
2 Guidance Counselors at $15,250*		30,500
2 Chairmen at $18,340*		36,680
7,000 School Aide Hours at $2.13*		14,910
	Total	$2,346,710*

* Includes fringe benefits

2. PROJECT TITLE: IMPROVING INSTRUCTION AND SERVICES IN SCHOOLS FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED CHILDREN

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This is a proposal to recycle project #30-00-00-66-014, to maintain the rehabilitative environment and supportive services for approximately 2700 disadvantaged socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children in 17 special schools operated by the Board of Education.

The major objective of this program is to identify and meet the needs of children whose history of school behavior has demonstrated an inability to profit from, and function within, on-going educational programs in regular classes.

Some specific objectives are as follows:

(a) To improve ability to get along with peers, teachers, other adults and persons in authority.

(b) To develop a satisfactory level of self-esteem which reflects an improved self-image.

(c) To increase motivation for school and toward a vocational goal commensurate with the child's ability.

(d) To improve academic achievement in reading and arithmetic.

(e) To provide a resource for disruptive children who are preventing the normal functioning of regular classes.

(f) To build a coordinated program that will include teacher selection, teacher training and carefully planned curriculum with a rehabilitative focus.

The programs for these children employ education specialists in many curriculum areas, and make available the services of guidance counselors, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists and remedial reading and mathematics teachers.

Schools included in the project proposal are listed below:

Old Designation	New	Borough	Name	District
614	P. 82	Manhattan	Cyrus W. Field	1
624	P. 91	Manhattan	Francis Parkman	1
612	P. 169	Manhattan	John Barry	2
621	P. 8	Manhattan	Livingston	3
622	P. 58	Manhattan	Manhattan	3
148	P. 148	Manhattan	Peter Cooper	5
613	P. 4	Queens	Orville Wright	23
611	P. 75	Queens	Robert E. Peary	24
612	P. 9	Queens	Walter Reed	24
611	P. 185	Bronx	John Paul Jones	7
612	P. 615	Bronx	Lewis & Clarke	11
614	P. 85	Brooklyn	Sterling	13
613	P. 369	Brooklyn	James Lawrence	13
617	P. 36	Brooklyn	Nathaniel Greene	14
615	P. 371	Brooklyn	Lillian Rashkis	15
616	P. 370	Brooklyn	Jim Thorpe	21
614	P. 23	Queens	Lincoln	25

For the school year 1967-1968, an evaluation will be undertaken utilizing City-wide standardized test results and other school records and data.

City tax levy funds will provide basic personnel and services. Title I, ESEA funds will supplement the program by providing such additional personnel as guidance counselors, psychiatrists, remedial reading and mathematics teachers and school aides, and such additional services as hot breakfasts, snacks and cultural trips.

BUDGET ESTIMATE $1,550,000.

3. PROJECT TITLE: MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The More Effective Schools Program, a proposed recycling of project #30-00-00-67-008, is a comprehensive program for disadvantaged children covering the years from pre-kindergarten through grade six. Of the 21 schools in the program, 16 qualify for Title I funds. Among its features are small classes, increased professional staff and extensive guidance services. This Title I project supplements the basic elementary school services in the selected schools included in this project. The 16 schools are all located within the poverty areas defined by the Council Against Poverty. Each school enrolls many disadvantaged children who require specialized educational services.

In pre-kindergarten and kindergarten, class size is limited to 15 and 20, respectively. The program for these classes will be centered around language activities. Teacher-in-service training will be continued. Workshop sessions will be held with the parents to involve them in the work being done with the children. Teachers will hold bi-monthly conferences with each parent.

In grades 1 and 2 class size will be limited to 15 and 20 respectively. In grades 3 - 6 class size will be limited to 22. Classes will be heterogeneous, that is children of varied achievement in a given grade are placed in the same classroom. There will be, however, many opportunities for regrouping within the school day, so that small groups may have special instructions according to their needs. The program will be organized around the development of academic skills with particular emphasis on reading and other language related abilities. In pre-kindergarten there will be three regular teachers assigned to every two classes, while in grades one through six, the ratio will be four regular teachers to every three classes. There will be additional specialists in art, music, and other curriculum areas. In addition, each school will have a corrective reading teacher and a speech teacher. There will also be a community coordinator whose major function will be to interpret the program to parents and community, and to obtain their cooperation.

There will be a clinical team for each school consisting of one psychologist, guidance counselors, social workers, an attendance teacher, and part-time services of a psychiatrist. There will be additional assistant principals assigned to each school.

The schools will receive their normal quota of supplies through normal channels and then will have these supplies supplemented by a special arrangement to meet special needs.

The More Effective Schools will intensify work on special programs for high achievers. They will also continue to work on teacher training. Academic achievement will remain the major goal of the program. Other educational goals such as personal and social adjustment, good citizenship and health will also be given adequate consideration in the total program.

Minor adjustments will be made in the program. The position of health counselor will be removed and the teacher assigned as audio-visual coordinator will be replaced by a para-professional.

The 16 More Effective Schools located within the designated povery areas, are:

District 2 - P. 146, P. 168
District 3 - P. 11
District 4 - P. 83, P. 154
District 6 - P. 100
District 7 - P. 1
District 9 - P. 110
District 13 - P. 307
District 16 - P. 120
District 17 - P. 138
District 18 - P. 41, P. 165
District 20 - P. 80
District 28 - P. 40
District 30 - P. 31

The More Effective Schools Program is designed to prevent academic failure in the early years, by starting at the pre-kindergarten level and organizing small classes to insure individual attention to every child's needs. Intensive teacher training is part of the program which emphasizes team teaching and nongraded instruction.

The More Effective Schools Program is designed to develop the academic and social potential of disadvantaged children from pre-kindergarten through grade six, and to build self-confidence and ambition in the children and in their parents. The changes in structure and staffing of the More Effective Schools, as compared to regular schools, are instituted with the specific intention of helping the project to reach its goals. The academic program is designed at each age level to provide the maximum opportunity for each child to realize his potential.

BUDGET ESTIMATE

Number	Position or Item	Total
40	Assistant Principal	$ 672,000 *
31	Secretary	204,600 *
31	Guidance Counselor	465,000 *
17.5	Speech Teacher	180,600 *
15	Attendance Teacher	162,000 *
634	Teachers (Pre-K and K; Remedial, Enrichment, Community Coordinator, Cluster, etc.)	6,280,400 *
30.6	Psychologists and Social Workers	363,528 *
50,730	School Aide Hours (Teacher Aides and Audio-Visual Technicians)	108,055 *
	Supplies	158,817
	Total	$ 8,595,000

* Includes fringe benefits.

4. PROJECT TITLE: SERVICES TO CHILDREN IN OPEN ENROLLMENT RECEIVING SCHOOLS

4. a. PROJECT TITLE: SERVICES TO CHILDREN IN OPEN ENROLLMENT RECEIVING SCHOOLS - ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This proposal is intended to re-cycle a part of project #30-00-00-67-006-A under Title I, ESEA involving the use of additional personnel and services for pupils from poverty areas who attend elementary schools outside their neighborhoods under the Open Enrollment and Free Choice Programs. Federal guidelines state very clearly that Title I services must "follow the child." These children should not be deprived of the services they would have received in the neighborhood schools, if they elect to participate in the Open Enrollment Program.

The objective of the program is to improve the child's ability in reading. In this context, corrective reading teachers will be assigned to concentrate on the Open Enrollment children. In addition to the funds allocated from Title I, the New York State Department of Education will make available $450,000 for programs to further integration, and tax levy funds will also be used.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

89 Teachers for Remedial Work in Reading at $8,635	$768,515
Fringe Benefits	184,443
Total	$952,958

4. b. PROJECT TITLE: SERVICES TO CHILDREN IN OPEN ENROLLMENT RECEIVING SCHOOLS - INTERMEDIATE AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This is a proposal to re-cycle a part of project #30-00-00-67-006-B to provide under Title I, ESEA, additional personnel and services for pupils from poverty areas who have elected to avail themselves of the opportunity to attend schools away from their neighborhoods under the Open Enrollment program. Quite obviously such pupils should not be deprived of services which would have been available to them if they had remained in their home schools. Federal guidelines have frequently stressed the principle that Title I services must "follow the child."

The major objectives of this program are to make available to pupils opportunities:

to improve performance in reading and other skill areas.
to improve self-image and attitudes toward school education and self.

These objectives will be realized by providing the receiving schools with such additional personnel as guidance counselors to provide individual and group counselling, corrective reading teachers to provide remediation, and teachers of special classes including Career Guidance classes and Special Guidance classes. In addition to the funds allocated from Title I, the New York State Department of Education will make available $275,000 for programs to further integration, and tax levy funds will also be used.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

31 Teachers for remedial work at $8,635		$267,685
31 Teachers of special classes at $8,635 (Special Guidance, Career Guidance)		267,685
11 Guidance Counselors at $11,170		122,870
		$658,240
Fringe Benefits		138,777
	Total	$797,017

4. c. PROJECT TITLE: SERVICES TO CHILDREN IN OPEN ENROLLMENT RECEIVING SCHOOLS - ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This proposal is intended to initiate under Title I, ESEA the use of additional personnel and services for pupils from poverty areas who attend academic high schools outside of these designated areas. The primary focus of this proposal is directed toward those pupils who would receive such services had they attended academic schools in their neighborhoods. The Federal guidelines state very clearly that pupils eligible for service under Title I should not be deprived of these services when attending schools that are not covered under Title I. In short, Title I services should "follow the child."

The major objectives of this program are to make available to these pupils, opportunities to improve their academic performance and to improve their self-image and attitudes toward school and education. These objectives will be realized by providing the receiving schools with such additional personnel as guidance counselors to provide remediation, lower class size, etc. In addition, supplementary allocations for school aides, secretarial help and laboratory help and instructional supplies will be included.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

98 Teachers at $12,740*		$1,248,520
13 Secretaries at $7,340*		95,000
4 Lab Assts. at $6,840*		27,360
15 Guidance Counselors at $15,250*		228,750
		$1,600,050
20,860 School Aide Hours at $2.13*		44,430
Instructional Supplies		75,520
	Total	$1,720,000

* Fringe benefits included.

5. PROJECT TITLE: A PROGRAM TO STRENGTHEN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN POVERTY AREA SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This program is designed to focus maximum educational effort on the poverty area primary schools by concentrating upon the Early Childhood program in kindergarten through the second grade. To implement this effort budgetary provision is made for a teacher aide or educational assistant in every kindergarten class in these schools, and a pupil-teacher ratio of 15 for the first grade and 20 for the second grade. Additionally, services will be devised or enlarged to enhance the objectives of this concentrated undertaking.

The objectives of the program are:

- To provide improved conditions for teachers and students to achieve learning proficiency from the onset of schooling.
- To remove obstacles to learning at the earliest recognizable stage.
- To provide supportive and corrective services to help insure that this educational effort may be successful.
- To involve the parents and the community in meaningful, sustained, significant cooperation in the education of children.

In order to lend purposeful support to this major undertaking, a comprehensive program is being developed. It is not intended to be prescriptive. Rather, each district, with its schools, will be expected to adapt these recommendations and use these newly available funds to meet the conditions peculiar to its own situation. However, the announced objectives must be met and the effort concentrated on the early childhood program of kindergarten through second grade. The personnel and funds will not be diverted for use at other levels however worthy.

5.a. Educational Assistant or Teacher Aide for Each Kindergarten Teacher

Paraprofessionals will be provided to assist kindergarten teachers in the classroom. There will be two categories, Educational Assistants and Teacher Aides, who will receive special training. Whenever possible, these will be indigenous persons. They will work with small groups in some activities, assist with a large group and alert the teacher to special needs of individual children.

A paraprofessional will be assigned to each kindergarten teacher in the target schools. (A full description of this Education Careers Program for paraprofessionals is included in another Title I project in this group, number 7, Career and Training Program for Non-Professionals.) The employment of paraprofessionals in kindergarten classes is an extension of a pilot program which was developed successfully in two districts in the 1966-1967 school year.

District Superintendents will make the choice of placing either a Teacher Aide or an Educational Assistant in each kindergarten class in the schools designated for this program. The addition of this adult in the kindergarten will help in the enrichment of the program for the children.

As an individual living in the school community and knowledgeable of its customs, language, resources and problems, he may help in interpreting the program of the school to the parents as well as the community to the teacher. For the "hard to reach children" whose parents do not send them to kindergarten, he may, because of his knowledge of the community, act as a resource in locating these children. The involvement of community-based individuals in the kindergarten will not only aid in the educational program but will help in raising the image of the school in the community. In addition, it is anticipated that under the career plan a number of Educational Assistants will be attending college. This will help in the future recruitment of Early Childhood Teachers.

It should be noted that approximately $500,000 of the budget amount shown immediately below will be used for pre-service and in-service orientation and training of staff personnel. As a necessary preliminary to the employment of these aides, this allocation is made possible by the fact that the process of phasing them into the job slots will take place over a period of time rather than at the outset of the school year. Thus the entire 2.8 million dollars cannot be utilized for salaries during the first year of operation.

BUDGET (1182 positions) $2,807,000

5.b. Teachers in Grade 1 (227) to help reduce teacher-pupil ratio to 1/15

5.c. Teachers in Grade 2 (620) to reduce teacher-pupil ratio to 1/20

The major purpose of these programs is to improve the reading level of children by means of smaller pupil-teacher ratio. The ratio of 15 to 1 in the First Grade and 20 to 1 in the Second Grade will be maintained in the overall program. Many methods of instruction may be tried. Samples of patterns will be made available to the schools. The ultimate goal of any method must be that children achieve. The program stresses:

- Understanding of developmental needs of little children; of special needs of the disadvantaged

- Curriculum for early childhood

- Methods of teaching reading

- Enrichment of materials for building reading program
- Diagnosis of reading difficulties
- Evaluation of progress
- Teacher training
- Community and parent involvement, participation and training

All teachers, with the exception of the coordinator will have a home room class. Additional teachers will not be used as O.T.P.'s or cluster teachers. The teacher selected as the coordinator of the program will be given the responsibility for the program in Grades 1 and 2, under the supervision of the principal. The coordinator will be selected by the principal on the basis of the person best qualified, in the school, for the assignment. She will take part in training sessions prior to the opening of school in September.

The coordinator will be responsible as the result of cooperative planning for:

1. Serving as liaison person with administrative and teaching personnel.
2. Previewing and listing appropriate visual aids and basic instructional materials for teacher selection.
3. Scheduling use of space and equipment.
4. Guiding weekly cooperative planning sessions.
5. Guiding and assisting in pupil grouping and regrouping in selected areas of instruction.
6. Evaluating the profile record of each child.
7. Guiding student teachers and/or apprentice teachers in their assignments in this program.
8. Active as liaison person between school and community.
9. Giving demonstration lessons.
10. Arranging for parent-teacher conferences.
11. Giving appropriate short-term informal tests in order to assess individual needs leading to flexibility in grouping.
12. Assisting in writing needed rexograph materials.

In addition to the Coordinator who will work only with first and second grades, other resource personnel ordinarily assigned to the school will devote a proportionate amount of time to these lower grades. These may include:

Non-English Speaking Coordinator
Auxiliary Teachers
Guidance Counselor
School Aides
Student Teacher/Apprentice Teacher
Librarian
One Cluster Teacher

Where space is a factor the pattern developed may indicate two teachers in a classroom in which there will be flexible grouping. The number of children within each group will depend on the abilities, levels and special needs of the children. Smaller groups, based on common needs and talents may be deployed to corners of the room, library, or where other space is available outside the classroom. Large or total group instruction may be feasible for special activities; special assembly programs, audio-visual, dance-festival, etc.

BUDGET

- 227 teachers (Grade 1) (1223 additional teachers in Grade 1 will be supplied with tax levy funds)	$1,250,000
- 620 teachers (Grade 2)	$3,410,000

5.d. Additional Materials for Grades 1 and 2

Each school will be allotted an additional $8 per capita to provide books and other materials of instruction. Among the recommendations is a program to supply 3 or 4 paperback books which the children will own so they may gain experience in starting home libraries. The objectives are:

- to develop a love of books and a desire to read.
- to enrich the materials for reading readiness or formal reading.

By furnishing all of the children in first grade and second grade with books, it is expected that the children will respond in a positive fashion to the experience of having their own books and starting a home library.

BUDGET	$790,000.

5.e. Diagnosis and Special Instruction in Reading (A decentralized program)

It should not be necessary to wait until a child has become retarded in reading before corrective measures are undertaken. A special allotment per school is to be provided for diagnosis and special instruction at whatever point in the 1st or 2nd grade it becomes apparent that a child is in need for special help. This help may come through our reading centers in those districts where they exist or by arrangement with college or university reading clinics with whom contact has been developed. The allotment will be graduated with larger allowances for those schools that do not now have the services of our own Reading Centers.

OBJECTIVES

To improve the level of reading achievement in New York City schools by clinically diagnosing and providing the specialized instruction needed to overcome reading disabilities of children, grades 1 and 2.

To use, in so far as possible, the resources provided by Special Reading Services and reading clinics outside the Board of Education to achieve the Board's objective, grades 1 - 2.

To develop among selected teachers the specialized skills needed to diagnose some aspects of reading retardation and to provide the special instruction needed to meet learning difficulties interfering with reading progress, grades 1 - 2.

In the eligible districts now receiving service from Reading Clinics of the Board of Education one of several patterns might be developed with a Budget of $1,000 per school:

- Expand diagnostic and teaching staff at present Reading Clinic.
- Expand diagnostic staff; return for special instruction by selected school staff all but deep-seated cases; plan for assistance and consultative service by Reading Clinic staff to selected classroom teachers working with pupils diagnosed by clinic.
- Set up with aid of Reading Clinic staff or outside clinical help one or two sub-centers in the district for diagnosing problems and providing special instruction to meet learning problems, grades 1 - 2.

In the eligible districts now receiving no service from Reading Clinics of the Board of Education one of several patterns might be developed, with a budget of $4,000 per school:

- Establish a Reading Clinic with the assistance of the Director. (Cost: $71,375 for the first year for salaries, materials, equipment. Two districts may want to pool resources and set up one clinic.)

- Establish small sub-clinics in centrally-located areas for diagnosis and training of selected reading teachers in special instructional techniques.

- Organize a Reading Team to visit schools to (a) diagnose clinically, (b) provide specialized instruction, (c) give special training to reading teachers and to grade leaders in Gr. 1 - 2.

- Use the resources of colleges and clinic staffs to assist with diagnosis and/or special instruction. Details will have to be worked out between the director of the college or private clinic and the District Superintendent.

The District Superintendent will plan with his staff, and in consultation with others, for the development of a plan to meet district needs. Each district superintendent will submit his plan to the Board of Education early in the school year.

BUDGET:	$660,000

5.f. Parental Involvement in Reading-Improvement Program (A decentralized program)

Each school will be given a small fund to develop programs for encouraging parental understanding of, and involvement in, the education of their children. This fund could be used to conduct workshops, to provide teacher aides, to supervise small children while parents are attending such workshops, to subsidize group activities for these parents, or to be used in other stimulating activities that are directly related.

The district superintendent will plan with his staff, in consultation with others, the projects for parental involvement as suited to the district. These may include district parent workshops, joint teacher-parent workshops, volunteer programs, reading rooms, courses for parents in how to help their children in reading, conversational English for parents to whom English is a second language, and the like.

A supervisor will be assigned to headquarters to coordinate this program and to serve as a resource person for this parent-involvement program.

BUDGET	$267,000

5.g. Fringe Benefits

Fringe benefits for professional and paraprofessional staff in all items.

BUDGET	$1,210,000

BUDGET SUMMARY

A. 1182 non-professionals in kindergarten	$2,807,000
B. 227 teachers in grade 1	1,250,000
C. 620 teachers in grade 2	3,410,000
D. $8 per capita for paperbacks	790,000
E. Reading Program	660,000
F. Parent Involvement	267,000
G. Fringe Benefits	1,210,000
TOTAL	$10,394,000

6. PROJECT TITLE: DECENTRALIZED PROGRAMS

6.a. PROJECT TITLE: DISTRICT DECENTRALIZED TITLE 1, ESEA PROGRAMS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

In order to continue the process of decentralization it is proposed to provide district superintendents with Title I, ESEA funds.

Each superintendent's allocation would be based on the number of poverty children in his district. Superintendents would be directed to consult closely with their local Community Action Agencies. Other groups, such as Local School Boards, parents, civic groups, etc. would also be involved. Where funds are extensive more than one project would be developed.

Non-public school pupils in the target areas would be eligible where appropriate and feasible to participate in these projects. Superintendents will be provided with detailed guidelines and would be guided by priorities established by the Board of Education, as noted in Section IIIB on page 5.

It is felt that the continuance of this method of allocating a portion of our Title I funds represents significant continued progress toward decentralization and another unique opportunity to involve district and community leaders as well as anti-poverty agencies in cooperative planning.

The promising beginning of the decentralized summer programs, in which district superintendents working closely with their community action groups planned over 100 distinctive programs uniquely responsive to community needs is thus carried forward and expanded.

BUDGET ESTIMATE: $5,000,000.00

6.b. PROJECT TITLE: EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FOR PREGNANT SCHOOL-AGE GIRLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This proposal is designed to provide a comprehensive program for pregnant teenagers in a number of school districts which are located in designated poverty areas in the city. The original proposal that was sent to the State Department of Education addressed itself to setting up facilities in District 12, Bronx, under the direct supervision of Dr. Seelig Lester. This proposal is intended to include District 12, Bronx and expand immediately to three other districts. They are: District 13, Brooklyn; District 3, Manhattan; and District 5, Manhattan. In addition other locations will be sought in poverty areas throughout the city. It is proposed to allocate $1,000,000 for this purpose during 1967-68. The budget estimate indicates the cost of educational services of one typical center. Fifty percent of the cost of each of these programs will be charged against the decentralized Title I allocations of the districts concerned.

The Board of Education will assume responsibility for the educational training of these girls. In order to fulfill the commitment to the comprehensiveness of this program, the Board of Education will cooperate with hospitals, health and social agencies in the districts mentioned. The girls will then receive medical information and care during their period of pregnancy and for the post-partum period, as well as an educational program.

Initially, the students will be girls up to the age of 17 or about to graduate from high school. They will be recommended for placement by guidance counselors, school administrative personnel and clinic personnel.

Class size will vary according to student needs and subjects offered. In academic subjects, it is proposed to program not more than 5 to 10 to an instructor. Non-professional personnel will be employed to assist the teacher. For vocational subjects, a room in each of the four centers will be equipped for business education. The equipment will include office equipment in sufficient supply to make possible, training in business procedures and employable skills. It is hoped that as the program progresses successfully, business concerns will cooperate with the project by accepting these girls for job placement.

Child care classes developed in conjunction with a hospital or a health agency and the Board of Education, and seen as an integral part of the comprehensiveness of this program will approximate 10 to 12 students in each center. This is particularly important where instruction will involve physical care and food preparation. A kitchen unit may be installed as a part of this proposal where necessary, so that students will be taught to prepare and serve nutritious foods.

Programming and instruction will take into consideration the need for flexibility because of the achievement level of the students and the fact that they will arrive and depart at irregular times. It is planned that these centers will be in operation during the summer months which in effect extends the services for these students. The centers will be under the direct supervision of the superintendents of the districts involved. Each center will be headed by a teacher-in-charge of the project who will supervise and coordinate the educational program with the hospital's or health agency's ongoing health program. The other center personnel are: 5 teachers of academic subjects, vocational business education and homemaking nutrition; 5 teacher aides; 1 guidance counselor and 1 school secretary.

Health services will include clinic visits, mental hygiene sessions, nutritional instruction and child care. These services would be provided by the hospital. The hospitals and agencies will provide social workers, psychiatric consultation and recreation workers, in addition to medical personnel. These costs will be borne by the hospitals and the agencies.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Module Cost (One Facility)

Teacher in Charge	$ 13,870.00	
Guidance Counselor	12,695.00	
5 Teachers	44,000.00	
5 Teacher Aides	8,325.00	
1 School Secretary	6,500.00	
Total		$ 85,390.00
Textbooks for Business Education	1,391.00	
Teaching Supplies	1,151.00	
Special Foods for Homemaking	384.00	
Total		2,926.00
Transportation		1,000.00
Employer Contributions (Employee Benefits)		4,000.00
Equipment for Business Ed., Homemaking		13,190.00
		$ 106,506.00
Alterations and Leasing		43,500.00
Total		$ 150,006.00

6.c. PROJECT TITLE: BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HIGH SCHOOL CLUSTER PROGRAM AND URBAN LEAGUE STREET ACADEMIES PROGRAM

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

(1) The first part of this project concentrates on 300 ninth year academically retarded and economically deprived pupils who will be entering Benjamin Franklin High School in September, 1967. This target population does not include the 100 pupils who will participate in the College Bound Program. The median reading grade is 6.3.

This project seeks to provide a multi-level attack on the problems of the disadvantaged by implementing the plans of a community-school-university partnership. Teachers College of Columbia University will participate in this program. The school staff, parents and community are represented by the Franklin Improvement Program Committee.

The program seeks to provide a curriculum which is responsive to the East Harlem child's own needs. It intends to focus the ninth year child's attention on the world of work. It will be designed to start him thinking, almost immediately upon entrance into high shcool, of how he will make his living. It will provide him with the stimulation which will relate the work at school to the work that will make him a gainfully employed citizen. In order to fulfill the goal, the project will also endeavor to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of each pupil to aid him to best utilize his advantages and overcome his disadvantages.

Individual and group guidance will be an integral part of this program. Vocational guidance programs will undertake to orient the pupils to job opportunities and job requirements.

To give pupils in the ninth year a feeling of belonging, the cluster program organizes a series of schools within a school. Each cluster will have four groups of 20 pupils who will be taught by the same five major subject teachers, four of whom would serve as official teachers. The teachers would meet during a common period each day to plan an individualized approach to each child.

The clusters would go on trips together, attend assemblies and lectures together. Clusters will compete with each other in intramural sports.

Another goal of the cluster program is that of the further in-service training of the teachers of Benjamin Franklin High School in understanding the needs and problems of the pupils they teach. The program would assign cluster teachers for one period a day to receive instruction provided by Teachers' College personnel in human relations, group dynamics, and problems of the minority group child. Teachers' College personnel have volunterred their services. Curriculum revision will be undertaken cooperatively by the staff of Benjamin Franklin High School and the curriculum experts of Teachers' College.

The program aims to meet the emotional needs of the ninth year child by providing the half-time services of a psychologist and a social worker who would work closely with the guidance counselors and teachers to plan the necessary services for children with emotional problems. The family worker would also assist in this area by serving as liaison between the school and the parents of these children. To enable the school to operate this cluster program, the following additional positions and services have been assigned:

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

5 Teachers	$ 66,250
2 Guidance Counselors	30,500
5760 School Aide Hours	12,256
1 Part-Time Psychologist	6,250
1 Part-Time Social Worker	6,250
Total	$ 121,506

(2) THE URBAN LEAGUE PROGRAM

An added component to the Benjamin Franklin High School project involves the use of licensed Board of Education personnel in the already established and ongoing Urban League Project: "Street Academies and Student Advisors." The prime focus of this program is to effect positive change in the behavior of the youth of the Central Harlem community and aid them in obtaining increased educational motivation and skills.

In this unique and innovative program Student Advisors will be employed by the Board of Education to service pupils who attend Wadleigh J. H. S. (a feeding junior high school for Benjamin Franklin H. S.) and Benjamin Franklin H. S. The 12 Student Advisors will be adults from the community who have been recommended by the Urban League and approved by the principal. Their positions will be in the exempt category at an annual salary range of $5200 to $6200. Specifically their duties will entail establishing a positive counseling relationship with students of Benjamin Franklin and Wadleigh. Each will service about 10 students. In order to accomplish this goal the Student Advisors will be available on an around the clock basis, seven days a week. The crucial factors in the effectiveness of the Student Advisor are his residence in the community and his acute knowledge of the forces which impinge on the lives of the youth he will service.

Two teachers to be recommended by the Urban League for service in this program will be Board of Education personnel who will work in the Urban League's store-front Street Academies providing instruction for young adults 17 years of age and older, who are out of school. Books will be provided for the direct instruction of pupils.

ESTIMATED BUDGET

12 Student Advisors	6 @ $6000	$ 36,000
	6 @ $5200	31,200
		$ 67,200
2 Teachers (including fringe benefits)		19,000
		$ 86,200
Books		1,800
	Total	$ 88,000

Note: 50% of the cost of this program will be charged against the decentralized Title I allocation of District 4.

6.d. PROJECT TITLE: ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE IN AN INNER CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: P-129-K

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The ultimate objective of this project is to saturate an inner city school, P.S. 129, Brooklyn, with services to improve pupil achievement. The Graduate School of Education of Yeshiva University will collaborate with District 16 in achieving this objective. In addition, the Ford Foundation has given a planning grant of $28,000 to Yeshiva University for an experiment involving the design for a "model" school at P.S. 129, which is located in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn. A high percentage of the pupils in this school are educationally, economically and socially disadvantaged. The average child is considerably below the city norm in reading.

The project which is the result of intensive, cooperative planning by the district superintendent, the school staff, the parents, the Local School Board, the community action agency (Youth-In-Action) and the University's Project Beacon personnel, will focus on the following five areas:

1. Decentralization
2. The Learning Center
3. The Saturation Program
4. In-Service Training
5. Science Program

1 Decentralization

In decentralization, the Local School Board will administer and evaluate the entire program. As part of this decentralization a Governing Board will be established consisting of a representative from the Local School Board; the District Superintendent or his representative; the principal; a teacher selected by teachers; a parent selected by parents; a community leader chosen by the parents; the project coordinator; and the director of the Project Beacon. It will be the function of the Governing Board to (1) arrange for establishment of educational goals and standards; (2) evaluate the programs, the training, and the services performed by Yeshiva University; and (3) plan and approve budget allocations and expenditures. The Governing Board will meet regularly at stated intervals.

2 The Learning Center

The Learning Center will be established to service those children who are severely retarded in reading and who have not responded to the regular school program. Because many of these children find it difficult to learn within the regular school setting, the majority of them will be disruptive children. The program of the learning center will include clinical diagnosis of the reading problems of the children involved in the Center, and plans and implementation of individualized reading methods suited to the needs of the children. The program will operate with six teachers, one of whom will be responsible for the administration of the center.

Four Educational Aides from the community will assist the teachers in the operation of the program and will give small group instruction. Yeshiva University will assume the responsibility for training the teachers and aides in this program.

The Learning Center will have four ten-week intensive reading courses. The children selected will be at least two years retarded in reading and will come from Grades 3-6. During the year, 25 children will be serviced in each ten-week cycle, for a yearly total of 100 children. A number of methods of instruction such as programmed learning, typing and motor conditioning will be used. Because of space limitations, the Center will be located in rented quarters outside the school.

3 The Saturation Program

A Saturation Program will be conducted in the entire fourth grade and will involve 140 children. The essential features of this program are (1) heterogeneous grouping; (2) experimental curriculum; (3) individualized and small group instruction; (4) smaller classes; (5) special talent groupings: (6) intensive guidance services; and (7) a planned program for greater parental involvement.

Eight teachers will be assigned to the fourth grade. Six of these teachers will be assigned to teach a class consisting of approximately 23 children. The seventh teacher will be a cluster teacher. The eighth teacher will be in charge of curriculum development, small group instruction and remediation for the grade. Eight graduate students from Yeshiva University will be assigned to work with the fourth grade teachers as teacher assistants and give small group and/or individualized instruction.

The Family Assistants will be assigned to work exclusively with the fourth grade. It will be their function to act as school-parent liaison, set up a Parent-Teacher Association and workshops for the fourth grade, make home visits, conduct Community Information Programs and serve as consultants for the Governing Board. Three additional School Aides will be used to serve other educational functions in the saturation program. These aides will be young men who have been high school dropouts and who will be encouraged to go back to school.

Finally, a guidance counselor will be assigned to work exclusively with the fourth grade. With the help of a social worker and a psychologist, the guidance counselor will implement a program for improved use of social service agencies.

In this program, it will be Yeshiva University's responsibility to conduct an intensive training of the fourth grade teachers, help provide licensed teachers for the special talent groups, and help develop and implement new curricula and methods.

4 In-Service Training

Several all-day workshops as well as seminars with visiting consultants, demonstration lessons and professional guidance for individual teachers will be given by Yeshiva University for all of the 53 teachers on the staff at P.S. 129. This training, with the exception of the all-day workshops will be given during the regular school day. The all-day workshops will be conducted on week-ends and will be underwritten by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

Yeshiva University's professors will serve as consultants and will conduct seminars. Individual teacher training will be conducted by teachers trained by Yeshiva University. Group training will be given separately on each grade level.

The program will be continuously evaluated through meetings of the Governing Board and through separate meetings among teachers and parents. These meetings will be held regularly. The Center for Urban Education will be invited to conduct a full-scale evaluation.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Professional salaries - 7 teachers		$ 52,500.00
Non-professional salaries - 9 positions		22,712.00
Consultants - 6		9,800.00
Equipment		6,988.00
Instructional materials		8,000.00
	Total	$ 100,000.00

Note: 50% of the cost of this program will be charged against District 16's decentralized Title 1 allocation.

6.e. PROJECT TITLE: SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAMS IN 5 SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Special Primary Program for five selected elementary schools (184M, 31X, 284K, 327-396K, 48Q) is built upon the base of the expanded program for early childhood education developed at the direction of the Board of Education for Special Service Schools. Therefore, the class size of 15 for kindergarten and first grade, and 20 for the second grade, will be basic for this special organization. However, the planned program will cover pre-kindergarten through grade 6.

Emphasis will be placed upon a dramatic enlargement of personnel in the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten teaching staff. The increase in teachers permits the assignment of grade coordinators for the early childhood program to lead and coordinate the instructional program on each grade. In addition, the person would be a master teacher who could train the young teachers whose need for support is great.

The guidance and psychological services will be stepped up considerably above a small base. The use of para-professionals, who are indigenous persons, will be sharply expanded to provide additional adults in the classrooms and to further release the teacher for instruction. The provision of an audio-visual technician from the level of teacher-aide will make available a trainable adult for supporting the audio-visual program without depleting the teaching staff.

The After School Study Center is a departure. The teaching force will be enlarged from 7 to 20. Provision will be made for school aides. The school day will therefore run from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. with elaborate services after 3 p.m. Ten of the teachers would engage in a reading, remedial and instructional program. The other ten would provide art, music, crafts, clubs and other forms of enrichment now found in the All Day Neighborhood School (A.D.N.S.) after-school program. The whole would operate under the direction of the principal who could extend his school program on a basis that will be significant in terms of numbers involved and services offered.

In effect, the program in these five schools will combine the significant features of M.E.S. and A.D.N.S. in a massive effort: to raise the academic level of children in poverty areas by special emphasis on a preventative program in pre-kindergarten through grade 2; to involve parents in a meaningful way so that they may become partners in promoting optimum academic achievement; to provide liaison with other grades in school so that an on-going program of academic emphasis may be maintained.

The program would operate in the five schools from September 1, 1967 through June 30, 1968.

Predicated upon a register of 1,000 the schools will add the following services beyond those planned for the new Special Service Schools, effective September, 1967 - 50% of the cost of each of these programs will be charged against the decentralized Title I allocation of the districts concerned.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Additional Staff - 5 schools

Number of:	Salaries including Fringe Benefits
5 Assistant Principals	$ 87,500
5 School Secretaries	37,500
10 Junior Guidance Citizenship Teachers	111,250
10 Teachers (Grades 1-6)	108,750
15 Kindergarten Teachers	140,625
5 Pre-kindergarten Teachers	46,875
1-1/2 Speech Teachers	17,813
2-1/2 Guidance Counselors	36,250
2-1/2 Positions of Supportive Clinical Services	34,695
48 Para-professionals	116,417

After-School Study Centers

5 Principals	7,869
65 Teachers	82,732
5 Secretaries	2,580
Sub Total	$ 830,856

Enrichment Materials

Language Labs for first grade	$ 17,500
Special Easy Reader Packages	1,500
Sub Total	$ 19,000

Summary

Staff	$830,856		
Materials	19,000		
		Total	$849,856

6.f. PROJECT TITLE: TEACHER TRAINING AND READING INSTITUTES IN POVERTY AREA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Twelve Teacher Training Institutes and thirteen Reading Institutes will be established this fall. These institutes will be developed and operated in the following school districts: 4, 5, 6, 14, 17 and 18. They will have both types of institutes.

District 7 will conduct a Reading Institute only.

These 2 types of teacher training operations will complete the cycle of teacher training, begun during the summer, for those districts whose superintendents preferred to carry out their programs during the coming school year.

Reading Institutes:

The Reading Institutes in each of the 7 districts will train Title I teachers of disadvantaged children in the teaching of reading. Teachers to be trained are those serving in junior, intermediate and high schools in which a large majority of disadvantaged children are enrolled.

Instructors will be experienced teachers and/or supervisors with training and extensive experience in the teaching of reading, assigned to the institute by each district superintendent.

The program will be designed by the district superintendent in consultation with the Project Coordinator, a committee of instructors and representatives from Community Action Agencies, Local School Boards, and others.

Content, method and materials of instruction will be based on that which is most appropriate for the teaching of reading to the pupils in the district concerned and on guidelines provided by the Office of Personnel.

A special outcome to be sought is the development of materials of instruction in reading for use by all teachers in the schools in the district. Emphasis will be placed on the development of methods and materials for teaching reading to educationally disadvantaged pupils on all levels, and in all subject areas.

The following pattern is suggested by the Office of Personnel:

An eight months program beginning September 1, 1967 and running through the school year. Sessions prior to the opening of school to be five hours daily; sessions during the school term to be five hours on Saturdays or be held after school for two hours.

Teacher Training Institutes:

The Teacher Training Institutes in 6 districts will train both substitute and appointed teachers newly assigned to the schools in the District; and substitute and appointed teachers who have served for a short time in the schools in the District or in other schools who need the training. The teachers will be those serving in elementary, intermediate, and junior high schools and will be selected by the District Superintendent.

The supervisor in charge and instructors are to be assigned by the District Superintendent. Instructors will be supervisors or experienced and able teachers in the schools in the district.

The program of studies to be followed in the training project is to be designed by the District Superintendent, the Project Coordinator, a small committee of instructors in the project, representatives from Community Action Agencies, Local School Boards and others. This program is to consist of the content to be covered, the methods to be used (particularly reading), and the equipment and materials to be used to improve academic skills.

The content of the program will include the nature of the community, its problems and facilities; the school curriculum, emphasis on necessary modifications of curriculum, the materials of instruction, familiarity with text books and other curriculum materials; methods of teaching, basic methods for the beginning teacher in basic curriculum areas, model basic lesson patterns; classroom management and discipline; the structured classroom, supportive procedures and personnel; the supervisory relationship and supervisory support.

Community specialists and consultants, seminars and small group dialogues, observation and participation in district school classes and practicum procedures will all be utilized.

The equipment and materials used will include audio-visual equipment available in the schools, illustrative materials and realia.

The following pattern is suggested by the Office of Personnel:

An eight months program beginning September 1, 1967 and running through the school year. Sessions prior to the opening of school to be five hours daily;

sessions during the school term to be five hours on Saturdays or to be held after school for two hours.

The standard budget for each institute is $25,000.00 for each school district.

Instructors and coordinators will be compensated at established rates. Teacher participants will receive the standard stipend of $15.00 per 5 hour day and proportionately less for fewer hours.

The Project period will extend from September 1, 1967 to March 30, 1968 and the specific dates of the individual institutes will vary in accordance with the needs of the particular district as determined by the district superintendent.

BUDGET ESTIMATE

A. Teacher Training Institutes Cost of One (1) Institute

Coordinator	(1)	3 Days	$50.50	$151
	30 2 hour sessions		18.00	540
Assistant Coordinator	(1)	3 Days	48.00	144
	30 2 hour sessions		16.00	480
School Secretary	(1)	3 Days	22.50	67
	30 2 hour sessions		6.00	180
Teacher Trainers	(6)	3 Days	43.00	774
	30 2 hour sessions		14.00	2,520
Consultants	10 2 hour sessions		14.00	140
Stipends to Teacher Trainees	(100)	2 Days	15.00	3,000
	28 2 hour sessions		6.00	16,800
				$ 24,797

Cost of 6 Teacher Training Institutes.................. $148,782

B. Reading Institutes Cost of One (1) Institute

Coordinator	(1)	3 Days	$50.50	$151
	30 2 hour sessions		18.00	540
Assistant Coordinator	(1)	3 Days	48.00	144
	30 2 hour sessions		16.00	480
School Secretary	(1)	3 Days	22.50	67
	30 2 hour sessions		6.00	180
Teacher Trainers	(6)	3 Days	43.00	774
	30 2 hour sessions		14.00	2,520
Consultants	10 2 hour sessions		14.00	140

Stipends to Teacher Trainees	(100)	2 Days	$15.00	$ 3,000
	28 2 hour sessions		6.00	16,800
				$24,797

Cost of 7 Reading Institutues.............................. $173,579

Total Cost of Teacher Training and Reading Institutes..................... $322,361

Note: The sum of $1,000,000 is proposed as the Title I, 1967-68 allocation for teacher training in disadvantaged areas. This project will leave a reserve of $677,639 and the Office of Personnel will subsequently submit further teacher training proposals in that amount.

6.g. PROJECT TITLE: AFTER-SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS IN ELEMENTARY, INTERMEDIATE AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN POVERTY AREAS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project is designed as a substitute for projects #30-00-00-67-002A and B in order to provide after-school service for children who reside in the poverty areas of the city. Through this extension of the school day children are given remedial assistance and an opportunity to improve their academic skills and increase their self-confidence and motivation.

The after-school program will be under the supervision of district superintendents. This extends the scope of the Board of Education's movement toward decentralization.

Each district superintendent, after consultation with the local Community Action Agency and other groups in the community, will decide among various alternatives:

-- Keep the Center as it was last year
-- Add or subtract various components
-- Change locations
-- Create new alternatives, keeping in mind the prime objective of academic improvement for the pupils of the district

Each district superintendent will be given a budget for such After-School Study Centers from within the total allocation of $3,500,000. The size of the budget will be proportional to the number of school children in poverty areas in his district.

The district superintendents will consult with their local community action agencies and with other groups in the community and share with them the pertinent information concerning the structure and assignment of After-School Study Centers for the schools in their districts. It is proposed that classes in these centers meet three days per week from 3:15 to 5:15 p.m. Principals should be directed to utilize the two hour sessions as 2 one-hour periods or three 40-minute periods. This apportionment of time would allow pupils to attend more than one activity, thus maintaining interest, variety and better attendance. This will also permit children arriving from Open Enrollment or non-public schools at a later time to participate in the program at the second hour. Non-public school pupils who reside in the attendance area of a school with an After-School Study Center are eligible to attend the program, upon recommendation by their home school.

The basic center staff, which is recommended to offer remedial assistance in academic subjects, would consist of seven teachers, a school secretary and a supervisor, preferably from the day school in which the center is housed. In 8 selected districts, in poverty areas, it is proposed that the Homework Helper component be added to the A.S.S.C. The Homework Helper program has been in operation for 5 years under the joint auspices of the Board of Education and Mobilization for Youth on the lower East Side of Manhattan. Evaluated by Columbia University, it was found to have achieved an upgrading of academic achievement of the high school students employed as tutors as well as of the children serviced. This added component would replace the homework teacher position. With the allocation of approximately $650,000 for this component it is proposed that 40 Homework Helper Centers, 5 in each of the eight districts be established. Although a part of the A.S.S.C. program, it will be under central administration, with field supervisors and a city-wide coordinator of the program. Each center would employ 15 tutors and service 40 pupils. Thus 1600 youngsters will be serviced in this aspect of the program by 600 high school tutors.

During the preliminary planning of this component, discussions were held with Neighborhood Youth Corps officials and it was indicated that the Corps may be willing to fund an additional five tutors per center. This would increase the per center service figure to 20 tutors and 50 pupils without increasing the basic cost of a center to the Board of Education. Each Homework Helper Center would also include a teacher, a school aide and a secretary (part-time). It should be noted that the service these tutors render is on a one to one basis. Each area coordinator would supervise 5 centers.

District Superintendents will be encouraged to structure certain aspects of the After-School Study Centers to meet their district's needs as long as the focus of the program is on academic improvement outside of regular school hours. In certain instances the district superintendent may assign teachers to work in Community Action Agency programs with the stipulation that these teachers function under the supervision of the district superintendent or his representative.

In order to meet the needs of many gifted pupils it is proposed that a component be set up in selected schools comprising three teaching positions with instruction focused on creative language arts and science. It is further proposed that instruction be given in Negro and Puerto Rican history and culture in selected schools. An additional teacher and field supervision by the Office of Human Relations will be provided for this aspect. The district superintendent will be permitted to employ consultants from the community, paid at the teacher rate, to help conduct this part of the program.

District Superintendents if they wish, may include a music and art component in one or more of the centers under their jurisdiction. In short, principals and superintendents may, after consultation, add or subtract components, provided the district budget for this purpose is not exceeded.

Commingling of public and non-public school children, regular communication between A.S.S.C. personnel and non-public school personnel, day school personnel, and parents will be maintained. School aides and additional secretarial service will be provided in order to free the supervisors so that they may more effectively supervise the instructional program, as the evaluation report recommended.

BUDGET ESTIMATE: - MODULE COSTS

Standard After-School Study Center (including Supervision, Secretary and 7 Teachers)	$ 12,996

COMPONENTS:

Negro-Puerto Rican History and Culture (one position)	1,406
Gifted Component (3 positions)	4,218
Homework Helper Component (including 1 teacher, 1 aide, 1 part-time secretary, 15 tutors)	16,295
Art and Music Component	2,812

7. PROJECT TITLE: A PROGRAM FOR THE RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT OF AUXILIARY NON-PROFESSIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD PERSONNEL FOR CAREERS IN THE NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Board of Education of the City of New York proposes to launch an Education Careers Program in 306 Elementary Schools, located in those impacted areas with the greatest concentration of poverty children. The program will begin in September, 1967. Major priority will be given to the establishment of a central bureau within the Office of Personnel to implement a viable career and promotional ladder in the categories of: Aide, Assistant and Apprentice-Intern.

The program will represent joint funding by the Board of Education and the Human Resources Administration with the participation of the various colleges of the City University of New York (see Appendix). Initial focus will be the utilization of auxiliary personnel in classrooms in kindergarten and the first grade, and experimentally in selected areas of service in the higher grades: the Guidance Office, the School Library, and services as School-community liaison worker.

Program Objectives:

The program is designed to: improve the learning process; help alleviate the shortage of teachers; improve communication between the schools and the poverty-area communities; liberate teachers from a wide range of non-instructional tasks; allow teachers more opportunities for experimentation and innovation; provide higher educational opportunities for community persons in the low-income groups; provide site-based training through the City University and private colleges; develop flexible attitudes and practices for supervisors, teachers and administrative personnel; and establish a career oriented in-service training program for teachers and para-professionals.

Procedures:

The program plans to meet these goals by:

1. establishing a central bureau within the Office of Personnel for the recruitment and development of auxiliary educational personnel.
2. establishing the career positions of Aide, Assistant and Apprentice-Intern, and
3. providing all aspects of pre-service and in-service training related to the program.

Implementation:

During 1967-1968, the program will be implemented in three phases:

Phase I - August, 1967:	organization of a central bureau for auxiliary educational personnel, recruitment and selection of auxiliary personnel.
Phase II - September, 1967:	pre-service staff and auxiliary training.
Phase III - October - June, 1967:	assignment of auxiliaries and in-service training for auxiliaries and regular Board of Education personnel, including teachers and supervisory and administrative personnel.

The central bureau staff will be responsible for the implementation of pre-service and in-service training; maintenance of program systems and analysis; initiation, execution and development of total program; development of operational coordination with administrative levels of Board of Education units, the Human Resources Administration and community action representatives.

Dissemination of Information:

The Office of Personnel and the administrative staff will provide information regarding this program to public and non-public schools, other non-profit organizations of educational purpose in the community and interested colleges and universities. Techniques used will include tapes, recordings, bulletins, development of a training manual, a procedure manual, and periodical reports.

Non-Public Schools:

Special efforts will be made to recruit and select Aides to assist the Title I teachers providing supportive services for non-public school children in corrective reading and corrective mathematics. These Aides and Teachers will be involved in the pre-service and in-service training to the same extent as those in the public schools.

Consultation with Community Groups:

The Council Against Poverty approved the expenditure of Title I funds to plan this program. Throughout the planning phase the Council has been involved and counseled by: 1. its administrative staff assigned to the Human Resources Administration. 2. progress reports submitted by the program developer to the Council. In addition, the program developer has involved representatives from low-income communities in various aspects of the program's development.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

A.	Staff Salaries	* $311,550
B.	Consultant Services	3,000
C.	Pre-Service Orientation	81,795
D.	In-Service Training of Auxiliary Non-Professionals	314,937
E.	Travel	1,200
F.	Space	20,000
G.	Equipment	7,518
H.	Supplies	10,000
	TOTAL	$750,000

* This refers to the Central staff to be organized and directed as a new unit within the Office of Personnel.

APPENDIX SHOWING JOINT FUNDING

The program will commence with the 1967-1968 school year and will involve 2,432 non-professional positions derived from the following funding sources:

a. 250 Trainee Slots Under the Scheuer Act
b. 1000 Neighborhood Youth Corps Trainee Slots
c. 1182 Positions created by the Board of Education utilizing funds from Title I, ESEA
d. Aides for Title I teachers in non-public schools

Sources of Funds

Board of Education (Title I, ESEA)

Career and Training Program (See appropriate Title I proposal)	$ 750,000
Aides for Non-Public Schools (See appropriate Title I proposal)	50,000
Aides or Assistants for 1182 Kindergarten Positions (see appropriate Title I proposal)	2,807,000
Total (Board of Education Contribution)	$3,607,000

Human Resources Administration

Cost for Training one trainee - $750 750 x 1,000 Neighborhood Youth Corp & Trainees	$ 750,000
$750 x 250 Scheuer Trainees	187,500
Total (Training Costs, H.R.A)	$ 937,500
Stipend for one Neighborhood Corps Trainee - $1,890 ($45 per week x 42 wks.) $1,890 x 1,000 trainees	$1,890,000
Stipend for one Scheuer Trainee - $2,730 ($65 per week x 42 wks) - $2,730 x 250 Scheuer Trainees	682,500
Total (Human Resources Administration Training Costs)	* $3,510,000
Total	$7,117,000

With this proposal the Board of Education commits itself to the establishment of positions for the 1250 people to be trained during the 1967-68 school year.

* NOTE:

This sum does not include an additional $900,000 pledged by the Human Resources Administration to cover college tuition and supportive guidance services for Educational Assistants hired in the 1967-1968 program who are accepted for college enrollment.

8. PROJECT TITLE: SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY TEACHER-EDUCATION CENTER (SUTEC)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This is a proposal to recycle project #30-00-00-66-027, the School-University Teacher Education Center at P.S. 76, Queens, a jointly planned and cooperative operation of the Board of Education and the Department of Education of Queens College of the City University of New York.

Both the location and physical facilities are so designed as to provide opportunities for a wide range of meaningful first hand experiences for teacher trainees and pre-tenure teachers.

This cooperative approach attempts to provide an effective teacher-training pattern and a nucleus of future leaders in teaching the disadvantaged. It also provides a prototype educational facility responsive to community needs.

This project for the 1967-68 school year will serve to upgrade education for the disadvantaged children enrolled in P.S. 76, Queens and in the other schools to which college students in the project will later be assigned as teachers.

This will be accomplished by providing additional personnel and services in P.S. 76, Queens. Additional personnel will include an audio-visual coordinator who will be responsible for making certain that materials are available which show multi-racial groups in integrated situations.

Three additional teachers over and above the number normally allocated will be used in order to provide smaller class size, remedial assistance, assistance with talent groups and assistance in the preparation of new curriculum materials.

Two additional assistant principals will assist the principal in working directly with the teachers. They will visit classrooms, give demonstration lessons, confer with teachers on a regular basis and be responsible for training teachers.

One additional school secretary will be employed to handle the additional clerical load imposed by the project.

Food in addition to the free lunch program will be supplied, as needed, to pupils participating in the before-school study program, the after-school study program and at snack time.

Cultural trips in the local and larger community will be coordinated with the curriculum.

Special personnel and training programs such as inter-disciplinary courses will be provided by Queens College for those education students who are selected for this program. Queens College will also provide instructors to assist in the supervision of these student teachers. Researchers will also be provided by Queens College to develop and revise curriculum materials. The Board of Higher Education will fund these services.

The over-all supervision of the personnel and program will be the direct responsibility of the principal and the college administrator.

Provision will be made for teacher orientation. For teachers newly assigned to the school, the sessions will include background material on the student population and the neighborhood. Teacher trainees will have their pre-professional experiences in the Center with extended opportunities for observation of highly trained teachers, participation in classrooms from the earliest years of college life, and opportunities to develop and test materials in close cooperation with the professional staff.

Provision will be made for the teacher-student consultation after regular school hours.

The para-professional personnel will include school aides and a school-community liaison person.

There will be continued follow-up of graduates of SUTEC for a three year period of teaching (pre-tenure years).

In order to support the additional services at the elementary school level and the college level, the School-University Center will be furnished with supplementary educational and testing supplies.

In view of the recommendations made as a result of the evaluation conducted by the Center for Urban Education, efforts will be made to increase the efficiency of the cooperation between the two co-directors, and a community advisory board will be organized.

The United States Office of Education has appropriated $50,000 for the establishment of a Cooperative Inquiry Institute and Research Team to develop and evaluate innovative outcomes of this project.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Personnel (8 positions)	$120,805.00
Supplies and Equipment (Audio-visual, office and home economics supplies)	10,200.00
Para-professionals	12,540.00
Teacher-Student Consultation	30,855.00
Transportation and Travel	17,600.00
Snacks	500.00
Library Books and Materials	2,500.00
Printing and Communication Services	5,000.00
Total	$200,000.00

9. PROJECT TITLE: IMPROVING THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN GRADES K-6

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project seeks to improve the achievement level of approximately 100,000 disadvantaged pupils learning English as a second language. It seeks to acquaint teachers and supervisors with the nature of the child learning English as a second language and with the latest methods of language instruction.

Commercially prepared curriculum materials will be introduced. Teachers and supervisors will be involved in the task of developing specific lesson plans for the implementation of Chapter 6, "Teaching English as a Second Language" in the Board of Education's new curriculum bulletin:

Handbook in Language Arts: Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, Grades One and Two

This project is composed of six distinct parts:

Part 1 - Assignment of District Coordinators

Part 2 - Supervisor and Teacher Training Programs

Part 3 - Pilot Projects in the Use of Teaching Materials

Part 4 - Implementation of Chapter Six "Teaching English as a Second Language" of Handbook in Language Arts: Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, Grades One and Two

Part 5 - Assignment of Additional Teaching Positions

Part 6 - Recruitment and Training of Spanish-Speaking Teachers

Part I - District Coordinators

A position of District Coordinator of English as a Second Language will be provided for the 15 districts having 9% and above of Non-English speaking pupils in C-F categories. The district coordinator will assist in the total district improvement program in the teaching of English as a Second Language by acting as a resource person and by providing training and assistance to teachers and supervisors involved in this program. The Coordinator will assist in organizing workshops and conferences.

District Coordinators will participate in a two week training program beginning August 28, 1967 and ending September 8, 1967 and will receive in-service training stipends. The following districts will be assigned District Coordinators:

Pupils for Whom English Is a Second Language

District	Percent	No. of Pupils K-12
7	32%	9,915
14	27%	9,132
12	23%	8,925
1	22%	6,424
3	19%	5,776
15	18%	5,423
4	18%	5,281
2	15%	4,789
9	14%	4,715
5	12%	3,351
19	10%	4,523
8	10%	4,075
16	10%	4,027
6	9%	3,334
13	9%	2,694

Non-public schools in these areas will also be serviced by the District Coordinators.

Part II - Supervisor and Teacher-Training Programs

An intensive training institute was held in Austin, Texas from June 11, 1967 to July 21, 1967. An Assistant Principal who attended this conference will be assigned to coordinate the program of the Teaching of English as a Second Language. A teacher is attending NDEA Institute in English as a Second Language at San Antonio, Texas, to prepare herself to become a demonstration teacher in the Teaching of English as a Second Language. The Institute will be conducted from July 24, 1967 until August 12, 1967. These costs will be funded by city tax levy funds.

An intensive institute for 30 teachers of English as a Second Language in Grades Kindergarten to Six was held at P.S. 96, Manhattan from July 24, 1967 to August 11, 1967 from 9 A.M. to 4 P.M. and stipends paid to the teachers participating were funded from City tax levy funds. The institute included the philosophy and principles of second language learning and the use of specific materials prepared by the Language Research Study of the University of Texas. The materials developed by the Language Research Study will be used during 1967-68 in kindergarten and first grade classes in two districts (Districts 5 and 7).

Approximately twenty-five classes in six schools will use the materials. This institute will be coordinated by the New York City supervisor selected to be the project coordinator. Three English as a Second Language Consultants from San Antonio and the University of Texas will conduct the institute. To further the training of teachers involved in English as a Second Language, 32 teachers will attend a 20 session seminar beginning in September 1967. The sessions will run from 3:30 P.M. until 5 P.M. at P.S. 96, Manhattan. These seminars will be conducted by the Assistant Director of English as a Second Language, the Project Coordinator and Consultants. The cooperation of selected staff at Hunter College will be used for consultation and in-service training.

Part III - Pilot Projects in the Use of Commercial Materials

Charles Merrill Company will conduct an intensive series of seminars on September 5, 6, 7, 1967 from 9 A.M. until 3 P.M. Participants will include teachers and supervisors of eight first grade classes in four Brooklyn districts. Districts represented are 13, 14, 15, and 19. Title I would fund the teacher stipends. The scope of the program will be devoted to orientation to the Linguistic Reader Series.

D. C. Heath and Company will conduct a similar series of seminars on September 5, 6, 7, 8, 1967 from 9 A. M. to 3 P.M.

Participants will include the teachers and supervisors of eight first grade classes in four Manhattan districts (Districts 1, 3, 4 and 5). Title I would fund the teacher and stipends. The scope of the program will be orientation to the Miami Linguistic Readers Series, to an understanding of the language program contained in the series and in the proper use of the teachers' manuals. The proposed appropriation of funds for purchase of these materials is:

Merrill Linguistic Readers (200 complete sets at $37.12)	$ 7,424
Miami Linguistic Readers (200 complete sets at $52.76)	$10,552

Part IV - Implementation of Handbook

Supervisors and teachers will be involved in the creative task of developing specific lesson plans for the implementation of Chapter Six-Teaching English as a Second Language of Handbook in Language Arts: Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, Grades One and Two. A one week institute beginning August 28, 1967 and ending on September 1, 1967 will be conducted for the 15 district coordinators and the Acting Assistant Director to adapt appropriate materials and methods in the teaching of English as a Second Language in the elementary schools, and the application of these principles of second language learning to the general school situation.

Part V - Assignment of Additional Teachers

Provision has been made in this proposal to relieve Non-English Coordinators in schools from full-class teaching responsibilities by assigning an additional 55 cluster positions. These additional positions will make it possible for the coordinators to engage in small group instructions on a full-time basis.

Part VI - Recruitment and Training of Spanish Speaking Teachers

In accordance with the recommendations of the Council Against Poverty provision will be made for the cooperative development of a plan to recruit and train Spanish speaking teachers for the school system. The allocation for this purpose indicated in the budget below may be increased as additional funds become available.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Part I	15 District Coordinators at $10,000 each	$ 150,000
Part II	Supervisor and Teacher Training	
	*Coordinator Training 6/12/67 - 8/31/67	1,205
	Assistant Principal's salary	14,490
	*Acting Assistant Director - Training 6/12/67 - 6/17/67 - 5 days at $43	215
	*ESL Teacher-Training 6/12/67 - 8/11/67 9 weeks - $75	675
	*Teacher-Training Sessions 7/24 - 8/11 32 Teachers at $75/week for 3 weeks	7,200
	Consultants fees	2,850
	*Travel Expenses (3 Consultants, Austin-N.Y.)	636
	Incidental Expenses	616
Part III	Pilot Project Teaching Materials	
	200 sets at $52.76 (Miami)	10,552
	200 sets at $37.12 (Merrill)	7,424
	Training Sessions (3 days) 24 teachers & supervisors at $15/day	1,080

*City-funded items of this project total $12,861

Part IV	Implementation of Handbook		
	16 Teachers & Director at $15/day/1 week August 28 - September 1		$ 1,200
	Supplies		1,718
Part V	55 Additional Teachers at $6,600 each		363,000
Part VI	Reserve for recruitment and training of Spanish speaking teachers		450,000
		TOTAL	$1,000,000

10. PROJECT TITLE: - COLLEGE DISCOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This program, which was initiated in September 1965, by the Division of Teacher Education of the City University of New York and the New York City Board of Education is being proposed for the third year of recycling (Project #30-00-00-67-003) to begin in September 1967. It is designed to improve the education functioning and college preparation of 1300 disadvantaged pupils in high school through intensive instruction and guidance. The program hopes to stimulate them so that they will be able to cope with the college preparatory program.

The program provides for intensive instruction in small classes, the use of enrichment materials, and some of the newer media to facilitate learning (films, radio, TV programs, programmed instruction). Representatives from the college faculties of the four city colleges are serving as consultants to the heads of departments and teachers in each subject area.

The program also provides for intensive guidance. The full time, trained counselor carries a case load varying from 100 to 130 students. Supervisors of guidance from the New York City school system are assisting with the supervision of the guidance services, and representatives from the Guidance Division of the City University are serving as resource people to the Guidance Staff.

The program includes trips to places of interest - colleges, special schools, libraries, museums, art galleries and business firms, and it provides for attendance at the theater, ballet and concerts. It further includes newspaper subscriptions, the distribution of pocket editions of books and special science materials. There will also be audio-lingual equipment. Students from the four city colleges are serving as tutors to the pupils in this program.

It is hoped that such a program will shed new light on the discovery, assessment and realization of pupil potential. Many of the practices developed in this program have been adapted for use in the more extensive College Bound Program which begins this fall in 24 high schools.

The program is located in five high schools, one in each of the boroughs. They include Jamaica H.S., Queens; Port Richmond H.S., Staten Island; Seward Park H.S., Manhattan; Theodore Roosevelt H.S., Bronx; and Thomas Jefferson H.S., Brooklyn. The personnel needed to implement this program include the following: Project Coordinator, Center Supervisors, additional Teachers, Guidance Counselors and School Secretaries.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Central Administration	$ 19,870.00
School Personnel	
5 Center supervisors	
73 Teachers	
10 Guidance Counselors	
5 Secretaries	950,180.00
Fringe Benefits	196,892.00
Supplies, Equipment, Phone Service	15,288.00
Total	$1,182,230.00

11. PROJECT TITLE: COLLEGE BOUND

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The College Bound Program is being instituted by the Board of Education of New York City for 3,000 pupils in twenty-four public high schools. It is the most far-reaching attempt yet made to help disadvantaged young people succeed in academic work and prepare for admission into college. Its size and intensiveness are an indication of the problem it has to deal with.

Each of the 24 high schools is selecting the great majority of pupils to be in the program from those who ordinarily would have little chance of succeeding in academic work or even finishing school.

Most are deficient in basic skills and subject knowledge usually associated with success in academic work. All our experience indicates that without special assistance, few would earn an academic diploma and still fewer would go on to college. Well over a third of the boys and girls selected for this program could normally be expected to drop out before completing high school.

The specific purpose of the College Bound Program is to improve the quality of work of disadvantaged pupils so that many more will earn academic diplomas and be eligible to go on to college. It is hoped also that with this special assistance over a long enough period of time, marginal academic students can become truly competent.

Every student in the program will receive instructional assistance in subject matter far above and beyond what a school can normally provide. Class size in academic subject areas will range from 12 to 20 pupils. This will permit intensive training in the language arts and mathematics. College students as well as able high school students may be enlisted to provide personal assistance if necessary.

Provision will be made for a thorough program of guidance. A full-time counselor will be assigned on a ratio of one to 100 pupils. He will be available for both individual and group guidance. The latter will provide for a four-year sequence of assistance ranging from adjustment to high school to the transition to college. The counselor will work closely with subject teachers as well as with pupils and parents.

Arrangements will be made so that the students will participate in a major program of cultural enrichment with trips to theatre, opera and the ballet. They will visit museums and attend concerts. This aspect of the project will be emphasized and the pupils, over a four-year period, will learn much about the cultural resources of the city and its surroundings.

There will be a close relationship between school and family so that home difficulties in the way of studying and learning will be lessened. Each school will have the services of family assistants representative of the community who can work closely with both the family and the counseling staff. In this way we hope to help bridge the gap between school and home.

Schools and headquarters will make every effort to keep local community groups aware of progress and to seek their views as to how the program may be made more effective.

A most significant part of the College Bound Program is the plan for higher education that is being worked out. At the end of their high school career, if the pupils have succeeded in academic work it is expected that there will be a place for them in one of the colleges in the metropolitan area. Forty of these institutions, including the City University, have banded together to form the College Bound Corporation. It is the purpose of this group to admit the successful graduates and provide for necessary expenses. This plan is unique in the country and the high schools and colleges will work together to help insure the success of the program.

Evaluation of the program will be made by both individual schools and an outside agency. The most significant part of the evaluation will be the matching of pupils in the program with a control group taking the regular course of study and following the normal school pattern.

We will be interested in a year to year and four-year comparison of the number of major subjects passed, the grades received, Regents' examination results, drop-out rates, conduct and ultimately the number of academic diplomas earned along with standing in the class. We will have figures on achievement results in reading and arithmetic but our real interest is in what can actually be translated into classroom accomplishment.

The opportunity afforded in the College Bound Program is unparalleled. It is successful, it can mark a turning point in the lives of thousands of our most disadvantaged young people.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS:

1. Andrew Jackson High School
2. Bay Ridge High School
3. Benjamin Franklin High School
4. Boys High School
5. Bushwick High School
6. Charles Evans Hughes H. S.
7. Eastern District High School
8. Evander Childs High School
9. Franklin K. Lane H. S.
10. George Washington H.S.
11. George W. Wingate High School
12. Grover Cleveland High School

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS: (cont'd)

13. Haaren High School
14. James Monroe High School
15. John Jay High School
16. Julia Richman High School
17. Long Island City H. S.
18. Louis D. Brandeis H. S.
19. Morris High School
20. Prospect Heights H. S.
21. Samuel J. Tilden H. S.
22. Walton High School
23. Washington Irving H. S.
24. William H. Taft H. S.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Personnel

I	Central Administration			
1	Director			$ 21,900
2	Assistant Directors	at $12,000		24,000
2	Senior stenographers	at 5,000		10,000
			sub total	55,900
II	School Staff			
154	Teachers	at $10,000		$1,540,000
31	Counselors	at 12,000		372,000
24	Secretaries	at 5,000		120,000
54	Family Assistants	at 2,375		128,250
	Consultants			2,130
	Fringe Benefits			513,000
			sub total	$2,675,380
			Total for Personnel	$2,731,280

Supplementary

I	Instructional materials & cultural trips	$ 65,000
II	Pupil welfare needs	15,000
III	Supplies and equipment for schools	57,395
IV	Headquarters supplies	7,450
	Total for Supplementary	$144,845

Personnel	$2,731,280
Supplementary	144,845
Grand Total	$2,876,125

12. PROJECT TITLE: EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR PUPILS IN CHILD-CARING INSTITUTIONS FOR THE NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The pupil count upon which the total Title I allocation is based includes children resident in institutions for the neglected and delinquent within the boundaries of New York City. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act charges the Board of Education with the responsibility for planning and implementing programs for these children. The Board is further required to design these programs within the scope of its own regulations but in close cooperation with the institutions to insure meeting the special needs of these groups of children. During the past fiscal year this obligation to children in institutions operated by non-public agencies was discharged in the form of summer programs.

It is now proposed to allocate $500,000 in Title I ESEA funds for programs in public and non-public institutions for services such as remedial instruction, guidance and day visits to places of cultural or educational interest in the City of New York or its Metropolitan area.

The institutions and the number of children eligible for service were designated by the State Education Department. The allotment of funds will be based on this data, but will take into consideration Title I administrative overhead and other commitments of Title I funds to public and non-public schools attended by these institutionalized children.

All programs authorized for these institutions will follow the guidelines set forth by U.S. Office of Education, the State Department of Education, and the Office of State and Federally-Assisted Programs.

The following institutions were involved in this program during Fiscal Year 1967 summer program (it is expected that several more institutions will participate during the Fiscal 1968 program):

Callagy Hall
Children's Center
Bethlehem Lutheran Children's Home
Booth Memorial Hospital
Brooklyn Home of Children
Catholic Guardian Society
Childville

Convent of Mercy
Heartsease Home for Women and Babies
Inwood House
Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy Home
Louise Wise Services
Mission of the Immaculate Virgin
New York Foundling Hospital
Phoenix School
St. John's Home
St. Joseph's Hall
St. Michael's Home
St. Vincent's Hall

These institutions fall within the purview of the New York Catholic Archdiocese, the Catholic Schools of the Brooklyn Diocese, the Hebrew Day Schools, the Greek Orthodox Schools, the Lutheran Schools, and the Episcopal Schools. Some are not affiliated with any sectarian group.

In accordance with ESEA Guidelines these jointly planned programs will be staffed by Board of Education licensed personnel. Although the programs will operate in the institutions, they will be under administrative control of the Board of Education. The Bureau for the Education of Socially Maladjusted Children will be the Board of Education department responsible for planning and implementing these programs. Heads of institutions will be consulted regarding the needs of the children and the programs will be the outgrowth of this cooperative planning process.

The programs will provide funds for administration, teacher salaries, auxiliary personnel salaries, educational supplies and costs of transportation.

BUDGET ESTIMATE: $500,000

13. PROJECT TITLE: PRE-KINDERGARTEN CLASSES IN POVERTY AREAS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The New York City Board of Education recognizes the importance of providing children living in disadvantaged areas of the city with an earlier educational program. Pre-kindergarten classes for four year olds have been organized in target areas of the city so that these children may receive an additional year of school experience.

During the 1966-67 school year the New York City Board of Education had in operation approximately 387 pre-kindergarten classes of which 315 were federally funded and 72 were city funded. These were in 177 Special Service schools and 21 More Effective Schools serving some 10,000 children.

In all classes, special services such as special foods, milk and cookies, clinic carfares, bus trips and supplies and equipment were provided. Also, additional personnel such as family workers, teacher aides, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, and early childhood supervisors were added to enrich the program under ESEA Title I. Also included in this program are eight speech teachers and one supervisor who will provide remediation for children with severe speech defects. In February 1967, lunch was provided for all pre-kindergarten children as well as funds for the in-service training of professional and non-professional pre-kindergarten personnel.

It is anticipated that a program will be developed for the 1967-68 school year to serve some 8,000 children. There is a need to provide extended essential services for the pre-kindergarten program. State funds are requested from September 11, 1967 to June 30, 1968 to enrich the parent component, to provide for para-professionals and to provide additional secretarial help to the schools for the new components added.

Experience in the summer program has pointed up the need to serve lunch to children from disadvantaged areas. The need for better nutrition, the introduction of new foods and the establishment of good eating habits can best be accomplished through this approach.

Since teachers of these classes teach two groups and are entitled to a fifty-minute free lunch period, it is incumbent upon us to provide experienced auxiliary personnel (para-professionals who have been trained by N.Y.U.'s Head Start Training Program and/or those who have received a combination of on-the-job training and experience in previous Early Childhood programs) so that the educational values of the lunch period can be maintained. The para-professional will also provide an additional adult to give greater individual attention to pupil needs in addition to contributing his special abilities and talents in the implementation of the curriculum.

The classification, recruitment, selection and training of the auxiliary personnel for this program will be consistent with the Career and Promotion Ladder Program for para-professionals which will be implemented with Title I funds in the September 1967 Kindergarten Program. The para-professionals will be referred to the programs by Community Action Agencies.

Employing educational assistants affords us the opportunity to provide for young children an identification with young adults. In addition, this helps in encouraging the recruitment of early childhood teachers.

The parent component requires a Family Assistant who is a community person with leadership ability and who is knowledgeable of the families in the area. Her responsibilities include the guidance of the family worker in helping to meet the needs of parents of pre-kindergarten children.

The Present Pre-kindergarten Program

The pre-kindergarten program consists of daily three hour sessions for four year old children from socially and economically disadvantaged families. It aims to provide opportunities which will better equip the children for later educational experiences. The expanded pre-kindergarten program is deisgned to provide the children with the following educational benefits:

(a) Greater opportunities for intellectual growth through development of listening-speaking skills, first-hand experiences, and experimentation with materials and equipment.

(b) Improved social, emotional and physical development by helping the children to attain a positive self-image, and aiding in the creation of a sound attitude to school and learning.

(c) Increased interest of parents in their children's school progress, parental confidence in their children's ability to succeed, and increased home-school cooperation.

The pre-kindergarten program provides for an environment in which children learn through exploration and investigation. The climate of the classroom encourages children to be free to ask questions, and to seek answers both independently and with the help of the teacher. The teacher plans so that children are gainfully occupied and involved throughout the day. She organizes the classroom to provide centers of interest which invite the child to participate spontaneously in activities that are sources of learning as well as fun for him. There are seven major areas: block area, housekeeping area, art center, sand table and water play center, library corner, music center, science corner.

Much of the content of the school curriculum utilizes the neighborhood and its resources for learning. These resources include the simple familiar things that may be observed in a walk around the block, e.g. stores, the shopkeeper, the traffic signals, the mail boxes.

In the informal, friendly atmosphere of the pre-kindergarten classroom the young child develops positive attitudes to school, to the adults with whom he comes in contact, and to his classmates. These are the basic learnings upon which rest his future attitudes towards education and society.

The children are organized into small groups of 15 with each teacher teaching one group in the morning and another in the afternoon. The following personnel are present in each school that has pre-kindergarten classes: early childhood teachers, teacher aides, family workers. Family assistants and educational assistants will be added through New York State funds. There will be clinical teams consisting of psychologist, social worker and psychiatrist.

Supplies and equipment will be provided for every 30 children, which include such items as work benches, cabinets, table toys, art supplies, books, dolls, miniature household equipment, records and books.

Medical and dental screening will be provided by nurses and doctors from the Department of Health and provision is made for follow-up treatment of children.

All educational personnel are required to have a physical examination at the time of employment and Certification of Tuberculosis Screening is required every 3 years for teachers and within one year for other personnel.

Several changes in the 1966-67 program resulted from recommendations contained in the 1965-66 evaluation. There was an intensive implementation of curriculum particularly mathematics, science, and music. New materials were sent to the schools and special teacher training workshops were held throughout the year. Enrichment activities in the language arts utilized direct experiences and trips. Pictures of various ethnic groups and special stories were used to help improve self-image of children belonging to minority groups.

Pre-kindergarten classes are housed generally in kindergarten rooms in elementary school buildings. Plans for conversion have been made to change those rooms not presently designed for young children.

Through the efforts of the Family Assistants, parents of pre-kindergarten children have been helped to meet their personal needs through referrals to local agencies, and clinics, and also to become involved in school life. Meetings held during and after normal school hours and on weekends offer opportunities for parent growth. The resources of parents and those of the community are utilized to promote interest in their own welfare as well as their children's.

Specific Arrangements for Participation of Children Enrolled in Non-Public Schools

The pre-kindergarten program is open to all children, both those who will attend non-public and those who will attend public schools in the later grades. Children in the school neighborhood will be admitted up to the capacity of the number of classes. Many children in pre-kindergarten classes in the public schools later attend non-public schools from the first grade onward.

In-Service Education

Early childhood educators and specialists in community involvement, from the colleges and agencies in addition to our own Early Childhood supervisors, will be utilized in the in-service training of professionals and non-professionals. A "team approach" designed to include the professional and non-professional personnel will be developed at district and individual school sessions.

The Schedule

Each child will participate three hours per day, five days per week for the entire school year.

Facilities

Where non-school locations are utilized assurance is provided that these facilities will meet all pertinent standards.

As of June, 1967, 304 positions were assigned to this program, with approximately 9,000 children (exclusive of More Effective Schools) being served. The reduction of teaching positions to 266 is caused by the fact that the Superintendent of Schools is recommending to the Board of Education that priority be given to classes for kindergarten children. When there is a long kindergarten list to form a kindergarten class in a school, there will be no pre-kindergarten class formed until the kindergarten children are accommodated.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Personnel

21 Supervisors		$ 300,000
266 Teachers		2,231,890
133 Family Assistants		500,000
266 Educational Ass'ts.		501,340
266 Teacher Ass'ts.		532,000
266 Family Workers		532,000
17 Parent Program Ass'ts.		85,000
60 Social Workers and Psychologists		614,300
School Secretaries		233,300
Fringe Benefits and Administrative Costs		576,000
	Sub Total	$6,105,830

Food, Supplies, Etc.

Lunch, Milk, Snacks, Special Food		$ 728,670
Supplies, Equipment		67,500
Clinic Carfare, Educational Trips		104,000
Evening Meetings, etc.		94,000
	Sub Total	$ 994,170
	Total	$7,100,000

Sources of Funding

ESEA Title I	$4,100,000
New York State	2,500,000
New York City	500,000
	$7,100,000

14. PROJECT TITLE: CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is a proposal to recycle project 30-00-00-67-017 to provide special corrective reading services for approximately 13,867 disadvantaged pupils attending 185 non-public schools. Selected schools in this project are located in poverty areas having high concentrations of low income families.

The major objective of this project is to raise the educational aspiration and achievement levels of selected pupils in selected non-public schools in disadvantaged areas. The specific objectives are as follows: (a) To increase proficiency in reading by providing corrective reading services for disadvantaged children in the non-public schools; (b) To increase general achievement and motivation for school work by improvement of the reading skills; and (c) To improve corrective reading instruction for teachers of non-public school disadvantaged children.

Teachers will be assigned at the ratio of 1/157 children, the same ratio as that in effect during 1966-1967, to conduct corrective reading sessions for small groups of approximately 10 children per hour twice a week. These teachers will be designated Corrective Reading Teachers, Non-Public Schools (CRT-NPS). The reading level of each pupil entering the program will be determined by standardized tests and informal inventories administered by CRT-NPS. Diagnosis of strengths and weaknesses in reading will be made by the CRT-NPS and will determine the formation of instructional groups. The program will be directed at pupils more than one standard deviation below the norm achieved on a standardized test in reading. By State definition and by general agreement such pupils are "below minimum competency." A room deemed adequate to meet the demands of group instruction will be made available by the non-public school. Where teaching personnel is not available during the regular school hours, efforts will be made to furnish corrective reading services after school hours on a temporary basis and only until adequate personnel becomes available.

Centrally located workshops will be initiated for selected non-public school staff. Instruction at these workshops will acquaint the non-public school teachers with the work of the corrective reading teacher, so that the corrective work will be reinforced in the classroom. In order to provide for an exchange of suggestions and materials in relation to the corrective reading non-public school program, orientation and teacher training sessions will be held for corrective reading teachers. The Coordinator of the Corrective Reading Non-Public School project will supervise and administer the workshop. Five reading supervisors will assist in the supervision of the corrective reading program in the non-public schools. Substitute teachers will be recruited and trained in the orientation and training sessions to carry out the corrective reading program in the non-public schools. These teachers will be assigned to participating non-public schools on a part-week or part-day basis.

From the recommendation of CUE's interim evaluation of the 1966-67 Corrective Reading program, the following have been incorporated in the project proposal: (a) Implement better understanding between classroom teachers and corrective reading teachers by conducting workshops for non-public school staff; and (b) Continue the in-service training of corrective reading teachers with special emphasis on use of the materials of instruction.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Personal service, including 90 teachers	$ 675,990
Materials of Instruction (Texts, workbooks, etc.)	203,500
Supplies	13,560
Workshops--for Non-Public School Personnel	4,250
Orientation & Teacher-Training Sessions	2,500
Total	$ 899,800

15. PROJECT TITLE: CORRECTIVE MATHEMATICS SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Corrective Mathematics Services program is designed to provide corrective mathematics instruction for approximately 23,132 disadvantaged pupils attending 185 non-public schools. The schools included in this program are located in poverty areas having high concentrations of low income families.

The major objectives of the program are:

1. To stimulate pupils' educational aspirations.

2. To improve pupils' proficiency in mathematical skills.

Teachers will be assigned to give corrective mathematics to small groups of pupils. These teachers will be designated as Corrective Mathematics Teachers.

Children will be selected for participation in the program on the basis of retardation in mathematics. Those children whose score on a standardized test in mathematics is more than one standard deviation below the norm will be eligible for service. By State definition and by general agreement, such pupils are "below minimum competency." One corrective mathematics teaching position will be provided for every 230 non-public school children who are eligible for corrective mathematics services, the same ratio as that which existed during 1966-1967.

The corrective mathematics teacher will be assigned to two or more schools per week. In correcting the mathematics deficiencies of the children involved, each teaching position will serve approximately 100 pupils in groups of approximately 10, for two one-hour sessions a week. In the event that it is not possible to secure personnel for all the positions outlined in this proposal during the regular school hours, then, on a temporary basis, and only until adequate personnel becomes available, the services offered in this proposal will be provided in the same schools after regular school hours, with staff recruited by the project coordinator.

The supplies, materials and equipment of the program will include items such as duplicating stencils, diagnostic tests, workbooks, practice materials, tens frames, storage cabinets, portable chalk-boards and bulletin boards.

Of the recommendations made by the Center for Urban Education in their interim evaluation of the 1966-1967 Corrective Mathematics Program, the following have been included in this proposal:

1. Distribution to Corrective Mathematics Teachers of such professional materials as texts and curriculum bulletins.

2. Increased teacher training for Corrective Mathematics teachers including use of instructional materials.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Administration (salaries)		$ 28,200.00
Teachers' salaries (101 positions)		656,000.00
Teaching supplies		40,800.00
Orientation and Training		8,200.00
Field Supervision (5 positions)		42,000.00
	Total	$ 775,200.00

16. PROJECT TITLE: GUIDANCE IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Under the joint auspices of the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance and the Brueau of Child Guidance, this program will offer clinical and guidance services to children in non-public schools in disadvantaged areas. These services will be offered to the pupils of approximately 176 designated non-public schools with approximately 91,000 pupils in the five boroughs of New York City.

If it appears likely that it may not be possible to secure personnel for all the positions outlined in the proposal, then, on a temporary basis, and only until personnel becomes available, the services offered in this proposal will be provided to the same schools after regular school hours.

The policies, practices and procedures to be followed by the professional staff in the program will be in accordance with those detailed in the manual and other published statements of the Bureau of Child Guidance and the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance.

Secretarial support for the clinical workers and office space where they may write their reports, confer and keep confidential records will be provided in centers throughout the city which will be located on the premises of various Bureau of Child Guidance offices. Since guidance counselors do not have central offices from which they can obtain secretarial support, arrangements will be made for such work by adding secretarial help to the administrative level for the supervisors of guidance. Such secretarial help can be shared with guidance counselors.

The nature of the project will be determined by the needs of pupils. These needs are those of all children: educational achievement, motivation, personal adjustment to family and community, development of the concept of self-worth, and wholesome mental health. It is proposed that clinical and guidance services be provided in the designated schools through two types of activity:

1. Clinical and guidance services in the non-public schools. All personnel are to be professionally and appropriately trained for these functions.

2. Orientation for staffs of both the non-public shools and the professional personnel assigned, designed to acquaint them with the program and the needs of the population to be served.

The staff for the projects (based on the ratio: 1 counselor per 2,000 students - 1 psychologist or social worker per 5,000 students) as a whole will include the following: Three psychiatrists part time, eighteen school psychologists full time, forty-five educational and vocational counselor positions (some will be filled on a full time and others on a part time basis), twelve transcribing typists and one senior clerk for State Department of Mental Health statistics. The ratio indicated above is the same as that which existed during 1966-1967.

Supervision will be provided for the staff as follows: Two supervisors of guidance, one supervisor of school social workers, one supervisor of school psychologists.

Administration and coverage will be provided for the program as follows: A supervisor of guidance who functions as coordinator of the guidance program and a supervisor of either psychology or social work who functions as coordinator for clinical services. Four stenographers are required for the coordinators and supervisors plus one senior clerk (to do payroll, statistical reports and stenography) and one typist.

Records and reports will be included as an essential procedural function. Each member of the professional team will maintain a daily log or other mandated statistical reports which will serve as a summary of his activities. In addition, records and interviews with pupils, teachers, administrators, supervisors, parents and others will be maintained. Equipment as needed will be provided. Expendable materials, postage, telephone service and professional library are included. Finally, a program of teacher training and orientation by professionally trained personnel will be offered to the staffs of the non-public schools. Such classes will be conducted in various locations throughout the city. They will be planned to develop and foster the understanding of good mental health practices by the teachers in the non-public schools as well as to assist in the implementation and utilization of the services offered.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Salaries

Number	Positions		
2	Coordinators (Counselors-Clinical)	$ 15,450	$ 30,900
4	Supervisors (2-Counselors 2-Clinical)	15,450	61,800
45	Guidance Counselors	9,000	405,000
18	School Psychologists	9,000	162,000

Number			
18	School Social Workers	$ 9,000	$162,000
2	School Psychiatrists	11,000	22,000
4	Stenographers	4,540	18,160
2	Senior Clerks	6,450	12,900
1	Typist	4,300	4,300
12	Transcribing Typists	4,540	54,480
		Sub-total	$933,540
Teacher Training			
2	Supervisors @$10.10 hr. 10 sessions	$ 30.30 session	$ 606
16	Counselors/Clinical 80 Sessions/10 Sessions		4,128
1	School Secretary	13.50 session	135
		Sub-total	$ 4,869
Other Expenses			
	Telephone and Postage		$ 7,000
	Guidance Kits, Library, etc.		4,432
		Sub-total	$ 11,432
		TOTAL	$949,841

17. PROJECT TITLE: SPEECH THERAPY FOR DISADVANTAGED NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This recycled project #30-00-00-66-019 is designed to provide speech therapy for approximately 7,500 disadvantaged non-public school pupils attending approximately 185 non-public schools. Therapy will be given those pupils whose speech anomalies interfere with communication and are severe enough to cause anxiety for the child and render him conspicuous. These speech problems include stuttering, voice disorders, cleft palate, cerebral palsy, lisping, lalling and other articulatory defects.

Alleviation of pupil speech problems should contribute to improvement in emotional adjustment and educational achievement. As these pupils improve in their ability to communicate, it is expected that they will develop greater social effectiveness and become more easily integrated in the main stream of the school and community.

This program will provide speech therapy once a week in small groups. Maximum group size will be ten. The speech correction teacher will confer with classroom teachers to keep them informed as to pupils' needs and progress and to enlist their assistance in carry-over of gains in clinic sessions, to speaking situations in the pupils' normal environment. Parents will be informed about the progress of their children in the speech therapy program.

All teachers participating are licensed as substitute teachers of speech improvement. Teachers will be assigned according to the same ratio established for public schools, as shown below:

	School Register	Teacher Time
High Schools	1500	.2
Elementary Schools	200-550	.1
	550 or over	.2
	1150 or over	.3

These same ratios existed during the 1966-1967 school year.

Whenever feasible, centers will be established for schools with registers under 200 to permit children to travel to such locations for speech therapy, if needed.

An orientation program for classroom teachers and for parents will be conducted to promote an understanding of the speech therapy program and to focus attention on the role of the classroom teacher and the parent in the remediation of speech defects.

In line with recommendations made by the Center for Urban Education in the May 1967 interim evaluation report, the establishment of a regional speech and hearing area to provide therapy for the more severely involved children on an individual basis will be explored and, if feasible, will begin operation around January, 1968.

If it is not possible to secure personnel for all positions in this proposal during regular school hours, services will be provided to the same schools after school hours. This condition will prevail on a temporary basis only until adequate personnel becomes available.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

I	ADMINISTRATION	
	Coordinator	$ 14,250.00
	Supervisor	14,250.00
	Stenographer	4,400.00
	Typist	4,000.00
	Total Administration	$ 36,900.00
II	PERSONNEL	
	28 teachers @ $6,600.00	$184,800.00*
III	TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR ADMINISTRATION	
	carfare for field supervisor, teachers in evening day assignments, travel to conventions	$ 800.00
IV	SUPPLIES	$ 18,700.00
V	EQUIPMENT	$ 12,700.00
VI	DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES	$ 3,000.00
VII	ORIENTATION	$ 1,135.00
VIII	CONSULTANTS	$ 200.00
	TOTAL	$258,235.00*

*The increase in budget is due to a more realistic salary schedule for the same 28 teaching positions, which were included in the 1966-1967 project.

18. PROJECT TITLE: EDUCATIONAL FIELD TRIPS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This proposal to recycle project #30-00-00-67-020 is designed to provide cultural bus trips for approximately 72,706 disadvantaged non-public school pupils attending 185 non-public schools in grades 1-8.

Arrangements will be made for the scheduling of trips to places of civic and cultural interest in New York City, based on pupils' school studies and particular needs. The trips will take place during the regular school day.

The participating non-public schools will provide adequate teacher supervision, will arrange for lunches and will assume the cost of such additional expenses as admissions, tolls and parking fees. The Board of Education will organize and administer the program.

The following suggestions from the interim evaluation report have been incorporated into this program:

1. An attempt will be made to stress maximum utilization of all buses and to plan trips more carefully.
2. Orientation sessions will be held for the principals of non-public schools or their representatives participating in the program. The topics of trip planning, bus utilization, and adult supervision will be discussed at these sessions.
3. Periodic bulletins will be sent to participating schools with helpful materials for trip planning.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Administrative salaries		$ 17,000.00
Transportation		94,550.00
Materials and incidental expenses		450.00
	Total	$112,000.00

19. PROJECT TITLE: ACHIEVEMENT TESTS IN READING AND MATHEMATICS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The purpose of this recycled program #30-00-00-67-016 is to provide suitable standardized achievement tests in reading and mathematics for approximately 40,000 non-public school pupils in grades 3, 5 and 7. The tests will be administered on the elementary, intermediate and advanced levels.

The tests will seek to ascertain the strengths and weaknesses of the pupils, so that appropriate instructional measures may be undertaken.

An orientation session for test administrators will be provided to give training to non-public school personnel who will administer the testing program.

The tests will be administered during the month of February, 1968. Including time for preparation of materials, for practice in test-taking and the actual testing, each pupil will spend about three hours in this testing project.

The tests will be scored by an outside agency which will return to each school, tabulations, frequency distributions and general evaluation of results.

The data will be available for the purpose of assisting the guidance, the corrective reading, and the corrective mathematics programs. The non-public schools will provide appropriate follow-up instructional procedures.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

Salaries for Administration		$ 8,000.00
Fringe Benefits		3,375.00
Test Materials		49,303.50
Orientation Material		600.00
	Total	$61,278.50

20. PROJECT TITLE: PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

It is proposed to mount a series of special programs for handicapped children in the non-public schools. It was originally hoped that such programs would be funded through Title VI, ESEA which is specifically designed to service these youngsters. To date only a small planning grant has been made available through Title VI and if additional funds are not appropriated we will utilize a limited amount of Title I money.

On the preparation of these programs, the Board of Education's Office of Special Services and the Title I Coordinator for the Non-Public Schools will consult closely with the non-public school officials to determine the types of programs needed and to plan their organization and implementation.

Children in the following categories have already been suggested for service under this program by a number of non-public school officials:

1. Blind and partially sighted
2. Deaf and hard of hearing
3. Mentally retarded
4. Speech impaired

Others may be included as a result of the consultations to be held.

These programs would, in accordance with Federal and State requirements, be administered by the Board of Education and staffed with licensed Board of Education personnel.

An allocation of $150,000 is proposed for this purpose.

21. PROJECT TITLE: AIDES FOR TITLE I TEACHERS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

It is proposed that the Board of Education provide non-professional assistance and support for the Title I programs which will be conducted in the non-public schools. It will be noted that elsewhere in this group of proposals is one that provides for the establishment of a career ladder for non-professionals.

The group of aides assigned under this program will be included in the career plan. The Board of Education will be conducting Title I programs in the following categories in non-public schools.

Corrective Reading
Corrective Mathematics
Guidance
Speech Therapy
Handicapped Children
Non-English Program

It is proposed that the Board of Education's Coordinator of the Auxiliary Personnel Career Program, the Coordinator of Non-Public School Programs and the non-public school Liaison Consultants and officials confer to develop a plan for the recruitment, training and employment of non-professionals in this program.

Auxiliary personnel so assigned would assist only the Board of Education teachers assigned to the non-public schools in the programs listed above. They would not function as school aides performing general services to the school at large. The allocation of positions would be proportional to the number of teaching positions allocated to the six groups of non-public schools.

The proposed budget estimate for this program would be used entirely to fund salaries and fringe benefits for the aides. Costs of orientation of professionals and training of non-professionals will be subsumed under the Career Program budget.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:	$ 50,000

22. PROJECT TITLE: PROGRAM FOR PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project is designed to provide a remedial program for pupils in non-public schools who are learning English as a second language.

This program will serve children from grades 1 through 8 rated C, D, E, or F on the New York City Scale of Pupils' Ability to Speak English. The children rated C or D will attend the special English classes for one hour each session two times a week. The children rated E and F will attend classes for one hour each session three times a week. As a pupil moves up the scale, he will be replaced by another child who may need this extra service.

The special teachers involved in this project will instruct small groups of children in separate rooms during the school day. In grades 1 through 6 the groups will range from 5 to 9 children. In grades 7 and 8 the groups will range from 15 to 25 children.

The audio-lingual approach will be used at the start followed by the teaching of reading and writing in the second language. A variety of drill procedures involving repetition of an accurate language model will be employed in order to eliminate difficulties of sounds, intonation, rhythm and stress. Many activities emphasizing pattern practice will be provided in order to develop automatic control and fluency in English.

The special teachers will confer with the regular classroom teachers to keep them informed as to pupils' needs and progress during the time set aside for teacher conferences. They will also enlist their assistance in carry-over of gains in the small group sessions to speaking, listening, reading and writing situations in the pupils' regular classrooms.

Suitable materials of instruction will be provided. These will include realia, language games, appropriate books and other necessary audio-visual resources.

In the non-public schools there are approximately 9800 pupils who have difficulty with spoken English and are rated C - F on the scale. The ratio of non-English teachers to pupils in the public schools is 1 to 800. This means that on the same basis 12 positions will be allocated to the non-public schools to service these children.

Supervision will be provided by the District N. E. Coordinators.

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

12 Teaching positions @ $8,150		$ 97,800.00
Fringe benefits @ 6%		5,868.00
Instructional Supplies		5,000.00
	Total	$108,668.00

APPENDIX
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
ESEA TITLE I EVALUATIONS
SUMMARY REPORTS
1967-1968

1. THE AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS

The After School Study Centers were organized in the fall of 1966 to provide remedial instruction in reading and mathematics; enrichment activities in art, music, health education; and the opportunity to do homework and use library facilities under supervision of teachers. Later in the year special classes were organized for non-English speaking pupils.

The program was voluntary and open to all children in economically disadvantaged areas. Centers were opened in 120 public schools and in five non-public schools in remote areas of the city. The centers were open three afternoons a week for two-hour sessions. Approximately 30,000 pupils attended the 1623 classes which were organized.

The evaluation of the program was based on data collected in a sample of 72 centers, and consisted of class observations and interviews with coordinators, center supervisors, and pupils. A study was made of the reading achievement of a sample of pupils on the citywide tests administered in September 1966 and April 1967.

Findings

The centers received adequate instruction materials from the Board of Education; in addition many teachers supplemented these materials with self-made aids, with materials borrowed from the day school, and even with some materials purchased out of pocket. It would be helpful in the future if the teachers of each center were provided with a fund for this purpose. Such a fund would help remove the economic obstacles to innovation and creativity faced by children and teachers.

Pupils attendance presented a problem, especially during very bad weather in the winter months and very attractive weather in late spring. Center supervisors and teachers used a variety of devices to encourage attendance. It appears likely that closer relations between afternoon centers and regular day schools, and more information to parents about the remedial program, would improve attendance.

Many interesting teaching methods were observed in the tutorial classes, such as instruction through use of word games, puzzles, the publishing of class newspapers, and puppet shows. A number of centers organized exhibits of the "students" art, library exhibits of children's books, and programs of music and plays. A news letter distributed to all centers circulated teaching methods and new ideas.

The children studied in the sample did not overcome their deficiency in reading but many did succeed in reducing the extent of their retardation during the six-month period between the September 1966 and April 1967 citywide tests. During this period, children in grade two gained ten months in reading, third graders gained nine months, fourth graders gained seven months, fifth graders gained eight months, and sixth graders gained seven months.

2. EXPANSION OF THE FREE CHOICE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM

The Free Choice Open Enrollment Program is a comprehensive program designed to promote quality integrated education in the schools. Pupils residing in economically disadvantaged areas who attend schools with a heavy concentration of minority groups are encouraged to transfer to schools with unused space and a more varied ethnic distribution.

The "receiving" schools are supplied with increased staff and services, including additional classroom teachers, supervisory personnel, guidance counselors, subject specialists, remedial teachers, community coordinators and school aids.

Pupil transportation from home to and from the "receiving" schools is supplied free of charge.

The current evaluation of the Free Choice Open Enrollment program for elementary and junior high schools is based on data collected for the 1966-1967 school year. The study included sample groups from the schools that received bussed-in children (receiving schools) and the schools from which they were bussed (sending schools). In evaluating the data, the elementary and junior high schools were considered independently. The visitors observed 92 classes in 11 sending schools and 197 classes in 22 receiving schools in the elementary schools. In the junior high schools, they observed 28 classes in 4 sending schools and 33 classes in 4 receiving schools.

The data were obtained from in-class and overall school observations conducted by experts in the fields of education and social sciences. The observers went to both the receiving and sending schools, using the same rating instruments.

Ratings in four major areas--teacher functioning, children's functioning, overall school appraisal, and overall quality of instruction--were made separately for the receiving and sending schools. The data for both types of schools were then compared.

In addition, reading achievement scores for a sample of fifth-grade children were obtained from the citywide Metropolitan Achievement Test given in April 1967.

Teacher Functioning

The conclusions reached on teacher functioning were based on ratings of teacher behavior and classroom lessons. The lesson data were based on ratings of teacher behavior and classroom lessons. The lesson data were based on ten criteria: (1) overall planning and organization, (2) level of creativity in the lessons, (3) extent to which the lesson related to material taught earlier, (4) extent to which a foundation for future lessons was established, (5) extent to which a foundation was established for children's independent work, (6) effectiveness of the teacher's verbal communication with the children, (7) opportunities for children to relate the lessons to their own background and experience, (8) amount of material covered, (9) depth of the lessons, and (10) extent and effective use of teaching aids. The ratings of the teachers were based on their attitude and appearance.

Elementary Schools: The data for the most part revealed only negligible differences in teacher functioning in sending and receiving schools, with one exception: a higher proportion of lessons observed in the sending schools was rated as well organized and planned (56 percent vs. 46 percent).

An overall appraisal of data for the two groups of schools indicated "above average" or "outstanding" ratings for the following criteria: the extent to which the lessons referred to earlier materials, effectiveness of the teacher's verbal communication with the children, and opportunities for the children to relate the lessons to their own background and experience. The observers also uniformly rated the teachers' attitudes and appearance as "above average."

The following areas received "average" ratings: creativity, forming a foundation for future lessons and for independent work, the amount of material covered, and the depth of the lesson. A "poor" rating was given to the extent and effectiveness of use of teachings aids.

In the junior high schools: On eight of the variables the observers' ratings showed that the receiving schools were "above average," which made them generally superior to the sending schools. The differences in proportion of "above average" ratings were sometimes extreme, particularly on the amount of material covered, the depth of the lesson, effectiveness of the teacher's verbal communication with the children, and teacher behavior. Even when both types of schools received an "above average" rating on a criterion, the proportion of receiving schools receiving the rating was higher. This was in the areas of lesson planning and organization, and the extent to which lessons referred to earlier material.

Establishing a foundation for future work and for independent work were rated by the observers as being "average" for receiving and sending schools, and almost all observers rated the extent and effective use of teaching aids as "very poor."

Children's Functioning

Seven criteria governed the evaluation of how well the children functioned within the sending and receiving schools: (1) behavior, (2) participation in the lesson, (3) interest and enthusiasm, (4) frequency of volunteered responses to teacher questions, (5) verbal fluency, (6) verbal intercommunication, and (7) interrelationships.

In the elementary schools: For two criteria, extent of participation and interest and enthusiasm, there were very slight differences between the sending and receiving schools. In both, the ratings indicated that most children were actively involved in the lessons and showed a better than average amount of interest and enthusiasm. The observers found that although most children in both groups of schools were exceptionally "well-behaved", the majority of observers reporting that these ratings were higher in the receiving schools (84 percent vs. 74 percent).

An "above-average" rating was given the receiving schools for the remaining four criteria, while the sending schools received "average" ratings for the frequency of volunteered responses and for interrelationships, and "below average" ratings for verbal fluency and intercommunication.

In the junior high schools: The contrast between the receiving and sending schools was even more striking in the area of children's functioning than it was in teacher functioning. The observers' ratings for the receiving schools on six of the seven criteria ranged from "above average" to "outstanding." The remaining function, verbal intercommunication, was judged as "average."

In the sending schools the children's behavior was the only criterion rated positively--that is, the children were rated as well-behaved--though the rating was not nearly as high as that of the receiving school children (94 percent vs. 61 percent).

The remainder of the criteria was rated as "below average," and in some cases "very much below average".

Overall School Appraisal

At the end of each school visit the observers rated the school as a whole, considering the individual lessons seen and all other activities observed. The overall school evaluation was based on the general school climate, the general attitude of the administrative staff, the teachers' attitude toward the children, the children's attitude toward the teachers, and the discipline displayed in the classrooms.

In the elementary schools: Here the view of the observers was that the receiving schools were far better than average. For every criterion judged, the receiving schools were rated "above average," with a low of 62 percent on administration's general attitude and a high of 84 percent on discipline displayed. For the sending schools the highest ratings were received in administration's attitude, teachers' attitudes, and discipline, where 50 percent were "above average." All the other variables were rated as "average" or "below average."

In the junior high schools: The pattern previously noted in the junior high school ratings is emphasized further in the overall school appraisal. The differences between the highly positive ratings of the receiving schools and the negatives of the sending schools were extreme. The observers felt that on all the criteria the receiving schools were "above average." Indeed 100 percent felt that the classroom discipline was "above average" or "outstanding." In contrast, in the discipline ratings for the sending schools, 57 percent were "below average." On no criterion were the sending schools rated "above average," and in only one as "average" (administration's attitude). On every other criterion the ratings were negative.

Quality of Instruction

The observers were asked to base their evaluation of the composite quality of instruction on the lessons they had observed and in terms of how they would feel about having a child of their own enrolled in the school.

In the elementary schools: Judging the quality of instruction by the lessons they had seen, the observers indicated no differences between the sending and receiving schools. This was consistent with the ratings given to teacher functioning. The instruction in both schools was rated as "better than average."

However, in stating how they would feel about having their own child attend the schools, 64 percent were strongly positive about the receiving school and 73 percent were extremely negative regarding the sending school.

In the junior high schools: In considering the quality of instruction of the observed lessons, 52 percent of the observers rated the receiving schools "above average" or "outstanding," as compared with 26 percent of the sending schools in the same category.

In responding to how they would feel about having their own child attend the schools, every one of the observers was strongly positive or enthusiastic about sending his child to the receiving school as compared with 71 percent who were equally negative about having a child in the sending school the differences were almost as far apart as possible on rating scale.

Achievement in Reading

Achievement data in reading were available for all children in the receiving and sending schools studied. Separate data for the children being bussed were obtained for a sample of the children currently in the fifth grade who were studied in the 1966 evaluation of the Open Enrollment program. Overall, the fifth grade in the receiving schools had a mean reading level of 6.4, with the children being bussed averaging 4.8. The comparable mean in the fifth grade of the sending schools was 4.7. Thus, these data indicate comparable performance between the bussed children in sending schools in the fifth grade, with neither group of children approaching the levels achieved by the resident children in the receiving schools.

CONCLUSION:

The 1966-67 evaluation of Open Enrollment concentrated on obtaining data on ratings on the in-class functioning of children in both sending and receiving schools. These data indicate that at both elementary and junior high school levels the children being bussed to receiving schools were functioning more effectively than children in the sending schools. That the differences were greater in junior high school than in elementary school suggests that the cumulative effect of Open Enrollment is positive.

3. EXPANSION OF THE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM

The 1966-67 evaluation of the More Effective Schools (M E S) program was conducted between October 1966 and June 1967.* The study consisted of the following activities:

1) Expert Evaluation of School Functioning, obtained by sending in observers to visit classes, and observe other aspects of school functioning. Observers were faculty of schools or departments of education, social scientists (almost all of whom had public school teaching experience), or the heads of independent schools. During the year they made over 400 visits to classes. The basic plan for the observations involved sending two-person teams into a school to visit classes. Two-thirds of the classes were selected by random procedures by project staff, from the school organization sheet. One-third were selected by the principal, after he had been informed as to the classes we had selected. Observers made three separate visits to each school. Each team visited several M E S and "control" schools.

2) Staff Appraisal of the Program, obtained through interviews with all principals, and a sample of assistant principals, supplementary personnel, and classroom teachers and through a questionnaire sent by mail to all 1200 teachers in the M E S program, returned by 371 teachers.

3) Evaluation of Pupil Functioning, obtained in four ways: (1) Evaluation by the observers of general level of pupil's class functioning; (2) pupil's own perception of class and school; (3) estimates of achievement in arithmetic through the Metropolitan Achievement Test in arithmetic, administered by the schools in March 1967; (4) estimate of achievement in reading through the Metropolitan Achievement Test in reading, administered in October 1966 and in April 1967 by the schools, and through an alternate form of the Metropolitan Test administered in June 1967 by project staff.

Criteria for Evaluation

Evaluation of any program always involves using some kind of standard or comparison. In this evaluation of the More Effective School program (M E S) several different standards were available. First, in evaluating school functioning, the observers rated specific features of the program (described on following pages). The observers used formal observation instruments or guidelines, and each of the observers made independent ratings, in light of their substantial experience in education. A basis for evaluating these ratings was provided by having the same observers rate school functioning in nine schools officially designated by the Board of Education as "control schools" for the evaluation of M E S. (These control schools were selected by the Board on the basis of comparability to an M E S school in factors like neighborhood and pupil populations.) A second set of comparative data was available from this year's evaluation studies of the Free Choice Open Enrollment program since the same observers used the same instruments to rate the quality of school functioning in these schools as well. Finally, a standard for evaluating data from standardized tests in arithmetic and reading was provided by the established achievement norms in these areas. The publishers of the Metropolitan Achievement Test provide norms for large urban centers like New York and Chicago and the country as a whole.

---

* This summary covers 20 of the 21 schools in the M E S program. One school, which goes only up to the second grade, is included in a separate section of the final report on the lower grades.

Evaluation of School Functioning

The basis for the evaluation of school functioning was the ratings of individual classroom lessons. Usually a five-point scale was used in ratings - ranging from "very much below average" to "very much above average." At the end of the day, the observers were asked to consider all the lessons they had seen and in conjunction with their observations of other school activities provide overall ratings for the school as an entity.

In terms of rating classroom lessons in such areas as overall teacher "planning," and "depth of the lesson," "amount of material covered in the lesson," "creativity in planning" the lesson, and using the lesson to "establish a foundation for future work," the observers felt that the M E S lessons were above average. In other areas like building a lesson "on earlier lessons" or on "children's experience," or establishing "a foundation for independent work," or "use of teaching aids," the predominant rating was "average." In the control schools, ratings were generally "average" with only the ratings for "planning" and "depth" considered "above average" and those for "creativity in planning" and the "use of aids," rated "below average." Overall, the ratings for M E S schools were considerably higher in the general area of classroom lessons than were the ratings for control schools.

The observers consistently made three criticisms of the M E S program. These criticisms were based both on individual observations and on ratings. They did not think that the use of heterogeneous grouping was creative or effective. Nor did they believe that the M E S teachers were making effective use of one of the major innovations of the program, the small class size. At each cycle of visits, for between half and two-thirds of the lessons observed, the observers judged that the same lesson could have been taught to classes of larger sizes with little or no loss in effectiveness, and they saw little evidence that materials or teaching techniques had been adapted to capitalize on the smaller classes. In fact the general absence of creative or innovative teaching practices was the third criticism.

On the ratings of general school functioning, the data distinguished even more sharply between the M E S and control schools. Evaluating "school climate," "discipline," "teacher attitude," and "administrators' attitude" in M E S schools, the observers felt these elements were "above average" and often "extremely positive." In contrast, in the control schools the ratings were generally "average," and seldom "extremely positive." Moreover, a majority of the observers concluded that the M E S school they had seen was providing "above average" instruction, which was "worth more" in dollars and cents than a typical school day, and was a school to which they would feel "positive" or "enthusiastic" about sending a child of their own. In contrast, most observers felt that the typical control school was providing "average" instruction, worth what an average school day costs, and no observer would have felt "positive" or "enthusiastic" about sending his own child to a control school.

Administrative Staff Appraisal of the Program

Principals of the 21 M E S schools were individually interviewed -- with a structured questionnaire -- to obtain their perceptions of the program. A five point rating scale was employed. Over a wide variety of questions on the program in general, on the principal's relationships with teachers, children, and community, and on their perceptions of changes in pupil achievement and attitude, the principals were consistently "positive," often unanimously so. Summarizing their views, they all reported feeling positively about the M E S program when it began and all still had positive views, with 17 of the 21 now feeling enthusiastic about it.

This nearly unanimous positive feeling about the program was seen again in interviews with 38 assistant principals, 41 specialists, 19 guidance counselors, 16 social workers and community coordinators, and 6 school psychologists. Of these 120 administrative and specialized personnel, only four - that is, 3 per cent -- expressed even mild negative overall feelings about the program, and only 5 others considered themselves only slightly positive. The other 111 reported that they were strongly positive or enthusiastic.

Classroom M E S teachers had the same view. Of 371 teachers out of 1200 who returned the questionnaire (an average response to a mailed questionnaire), 90 per cent were either enthusiastic or strongly positive, with 7 per cent slightly positive. Only 3 per cent reported negative views about the program. Like the observers, the teachers were also negative in their appraisal of introduction of heterogeneous grouping; more than half believed it was not used creatively or effectively. However, they did not agree with the observers' criticism on the use of small class size, for more than 80 per cent believed class size was used effectively.

Evaluation of Pupil Functioning

a) Observer Ratings

When the observers rated childrens' functioning in class, they felt that children in both M E S and control schools were "above average" on criteria like "participation" in the lesson, "volunteering," "interest and enthusiasm," "verbal fluency," "attitude towards teachers," and in-class "discipline." On the last two items, however, the M E S schools ranked higher than the control schools. On "verbal fluency," there were slightly better ratings in the control schools.

b) Childrens' Perceptions

When children in the upper grades indicated their own perceptions of the functioning of their class on a scale ranging from positive to negative, 59 per cent of the children in M E S as compared with 51 per cent of children in control schools, had positive perceptions, whereas 35 per cent and 41 per cent respectively had negative perceptions. The remaining children, 6 per cent and 8 per cent respectively, held balanced perceptions of their class. These results can be compared to results from the 1966 study of children in the Free Choice Open Enrollment program, which used the same positive-negative rating scale. Of the children being bussed to another school, 75 per cent expressed positive perceptions of class, and only 16 per cent expressed negative perceptions. Thus, while a majority of M E S children had positive perceptions of their class and how it functioned, and while this majority was slightly larger than in the control schools it was considerably less than the proportion of positively oriented children in the Open Enrollment program.

On a second instrument on which children were given the opportunity to express their feelings about 17 aspects of school functioning, pupils in both sets of schools consistently reported positive perceptions of most aspects of the school like their teachers' "interest," desire "to help," and "fairness," the principal's "friendliness," the "usefulness" of what they were learning, etc.

On all but one such aspect children in M E S and control schools held similar perceptions. The difference involved the fact that two-thirds of children in control schools said the teachers expected them to work too hard, whereas only half the children in M E S schools felt this way.

The data from these two instruments indicate that children in both M E S and control schools had positive perceptions of school and class, with similarities in their points of view clearly outweighing the few differences.

c) Academic Functioning: in Arithmetic

Childrens' academic functioning in arithmetic was estimated from the Metropolitan Achievement Test given in March 1967 by school staff. Since March is the sixth month of the school year, normal functioning would be on the grade plus six-tenths (2.6, 3.6, etc.). The median levels of achievement in M E S were 2.3 in grade two; 3.4 in grade three; 4.2 in grade four; 5.0 in grade five; and 5.7 in grade six. These data indicate retardation in all grades, ranging from two-tenths of a year in grade three to nine-tenths of a year in grade six. Data for the control schools are available from the city-wide testing program in arithmetic conducted only in grade three. The median level of achievement was 3.2, two-tenths of a grade below the level achieved in M E S schools.

d) Academic Functioning: in Reading

In reading achievement, the test given by school staff was administered in April when normal functioning would be the grade plus seven-tenths. In this case, data is available from both M E S and control schools. The median reading grades in grade two were 2.6 and 2.3 respectively; in grade three, 3.4 and 3.2; in grade four, 3.9 and 3.7; in grade five, 4.6 and 4.3; and in grade six (derived from only 14 M E S and 4 control schools) 5.5 in both. Thus, there were differences between M E S and control schools of three-tenths of a year for grades two and five, and two-tenths of a year at grades three and four -- all in favor of M E S schools -- and no difference in grade six. At the same time, these data indicate steadily increasing retardation in both sets of schools, even when set against grade norms considered appropriate for urban schools. In the control schools the children were four-tenths in grade six. For the M E S schools the same pattern held, although the gross amount of retardation was less; one-tenth in grade two; three-tenths in grade three; eight-tenths in grade four; one and one-tenths in grade five; and one and two-tenths in grade six. In terms of national norms, the retardation is about two-tenths of a year greater than that reported above.

Reading gains during the year, the mean gain for the M E S schools from October 1966 to April 1967, a period of six months, was eight-tenths for grade two; one for grade three; six-tenths for grade four; nine-tenths for grade five; and six-tenths for grade six. Thus, the M E S schools averaged gains of normal progress (for six months) in grades four and six, and better than normal progress in grades two, three, and five. For the control schools, the gains were six-tenths in grade two; eight-tenths in grade three; five-tenths in grade four; and five-tenths in grade five -- or normal for grade two, above normal in grade three, and just below normal in grades four and five.

The apparent contradiction of children gaining normally during the six-month period between October and April yet still falling further and further behind grade norms can be understood by considering what happens in the intervening period of April to October. A child reading at 2.7 in April should be reading at 3.1 when tested the following October, i.e., should progress four-tenths of a grade (his gain in April, May, June, and September). In the M E S schools, in that interval the children lost about two-tenths of a grade in every grade other than grade six. In effect this means that the teacher of any one grade must make up the loss of .2 of a year as well as the expected gain of .4 before, so to speak, even starting. Thus, the overall gain from any one October to April is apparently normal, but in fact the children are falling further and further behind. In the control schools, the expected gains from April to October were not realized either. However, in contrast to the M E S schools, there never was a decline: either the children maintained their April levels or gained .1 of a grade by October.

Conclusion

In coming to some overall conclusion about M E S, one basic consideration in this evaluation is the clear evidence (not detailed earlier) in the data that one cannot speak of "M E S schools" as if these were 21 homogeneous educational settings. They were not. By every criterion we employed, the variability within the 21 M E S schools was as great as, and in many instances greater than, the differences we have noted between M E S and control schools. There are M E S schools which were rated as above average or outstanding on almost every aspect of teacher functioning, or on the criteria for overall school evaluation, and there are other M E S schools which were consistently rated as below average or poor on these same criteria. In April, the range of mean reading achievement in the M E S second grades was almost a full year, from a school with a mean of 2.3 to a school with a mean of 3.2. Similarly, there was a range of 1.6 years in grades three and four, 1.7 in grade five, and 1.9 years among the 14 schools which had a sixth grade. Any overall appraisal of the "program" must recognize this variability in the evidence of the effectiveness with which it has been implemented.

Tieing all the data together, one would conclude that the M E S program has created schools that administration, teaching faculty, and supplementary staff believe are good places in which to function. Moreover, these schools impress outside observers as educational institutions that are better than comparable schools in terms of overall criteria like atmosphere, climate, and aspects of professional functioning. However, the data indicate that these changes in structural aspects of school organization, like teacher-pupil ratio and availability of professional services, have not had a noticeable impact on children's perceptions, their functioning in class, or their academic achievement.

There is some evidence in the data that the explanation for this inconsistency has at least two causes. The first is that some of the administrative changes introduced may not be working to the advantage of the program, and the second is that other changes have not been utilized for their fullest impact. Observers, teachers, and administrators alike consistently were negative in their evaluation of the mandated use of heterogeneous grouping. Perhaps even more important, observers consistently critized what they considered the lack of innovation or creative use of the very administrative advantages of M E S particularly the lack of any consistent use of small class size in the actual teaching process.

In short, this evaluation suggests that the basic program introduced under the label "M E S" has had a favorable impact on the adults who work in these schools, in terms of their observed behavior, their views of the program, and the general climate of the schools. But it has not had a comparable impact on the observed behavior, perception, or achievement of the children who attend it.

4. A SPECIAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM OF QUALITY INTEGRATED EDUCATION FOR SCHOOLS IN TRANSITIONAL AREAS

The program under review is titled: "A Special Enrichment Program of Quality Integrated Education for Schools in Transitional Areas." Its major concern is for schools in communities that are "in process of social and economic transition," and its goals are to contribute to community stability through increased specialized services to meet individual pupil needs.

The program provides additional teaching and non-teaching staff so that specific services of corrective reading, counseling, special classes, and reduced class size may be provided.

The program functions in 79 elementary and 37 junior high schools, many of which were already designated as special service schools. Also, migration had already produced an imbalance of ethnic groups in many schools so that for these schools the designation of "transitional" was invalid.

A sample for this evaluation of 20 elementary schools and 6 junior high schools was selected where special service programs were not operating and where ethnic groups included 35 per cent or more of "others".

It was decided to concentrate in this study upon the types and uses of specialist services, the changes in ethnic groupings, the changes in pupils' achievement, and the views of professional staff of the effectiveness of the program.

Questionnaires were sent to the principals and to teachers of long service in the sample schools. Data were collected from these questionnaires which indicated that principals and teachers tend to view programs differently. It was evident that some teachers failed to view the program at all; they did not know it existed in their school.

Principals said they were pleased with the assignment of new personnel and reported that they had assigned teacher-specialists to programs of remedial reading, of enrichment work in art and music, and of teacher training in their schools. They reported organizing a small number of classes for gifted children and many groups for improvement in reading and coaching in mathematics. They reported that the parents of the children receiving additional aid showed increased interest and cooperation regarding school matters.

Nevertheless, principals did not feel this program would be effective in reducing the migration of middle-class families from their communities. They ascribed migration to the influx of minority group families, to increased delinquency in the area, and to the desire for better housing. Still, they called for continuation of this program, seeing it as an improvement in school services for those enrolled.

Teachers tended to agree with principals in their evaluation of the program's effectiveness, and they stated similar causes for the migration out of their communities. They, too, recommended that the program be continued -- and increased -- with special stress upon informing teachers and parents about the program.

Teachers commented favorably upon increased library services, more remedial classes, and some enrichment opportunities in music and art. A larger proportion of elementary teachers than junior high teachers noted a positive impact of the program on parents. Some teachers were aware that guidance counselors had been added, but they were divided in reporting more service to pupils.

Data on ethnic groups in the schools were obtained from the Board of Education in reports of October 1964, October 1965, and October 1966. In the 20 sample elementary schools, the Puerto Rican population increased 20 per cent from 1964 to 1965 and gained 1 per cent more from 1965 to 1966 (from 1,885 pupils in 1964 to 2,616 in 1965 to 2,648 in 1966).

The Negro population in the 20 elementary schools rose 17 per cent from 1964 to 1965 and then rose 10 per cent more from 1965 to 1966 (from 6,705 pupils in 1964 to 8,638 in 1965 to 9,493 in 1966).

"Others" in the 20 elementary schools dropped 50 per cent from 1964 to 1965 and then dropped 9 per cent more from 1965 to 1966 (from 20,265 in 1964 to 11,380 in 1965 to 10,368 in 1966).

In the six sample junior high schools, Puerto Rican enrollment dropped 10 per cent and then 11 per cent in the period studied (from 2,203 in 1964 to 1,992 in 1965 to 1,780 in 1966).

Negro population in the six sample junior highs went up 8 per cent from 1964 to 1965, then dropped 2 per cent from 1965 to 1966 (from 2,499 in 1964 to 2,711 in 1965 to 2,660 in 1966).

"Others" in the six junior high schools decreased 5 per cent in the first period and 14 per cent by 1966 (from 6,361 in 1964 to 6,016 in 1965 to 5,145 in 1966).

The trend reflects emigration of "others" in all the sample schools and an increase of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils in the sample elementary schools. A decreasing register of "others" is also seen in the sample junior high school group.

Achievement scores in reading of pupils who had been tested prior to the program either in the sample schools or elsewhere and who were enrolled continuously in the sample school were studied so as to determine the effects of the program upon achievement.

Test results in reading achievement tended to be favorable for pupils in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 who were in the transitional schools and had been in the program prior to September, 1967. Mean achievement was generally above grade and above city-wide norms. Trends for the most part were toward greater achievement above grade as the time in the program increased.

The results for the junior high schools in the sample were not favorable. Not only were pupils in grades 7, 8, and 9 retarded in reading in April 1967, but they were relatively more retarded than they had been at the start of the program.

Conclusion:

In this study, data from the sample schools indicate that school personnel (principals and teachers) approve the program but do not believe it will be effective in maintaining integrated, stable communities.

The emigration of white, middle-class families from transitional areas has not decreased since the start of the program.

While school populations have been changing, mean reading scores of stable pupils in the sample elementary schools tended to improve during the operation of the program. In the junior high sample, trends were lower.

The data for the total group of transitional schools cast doubt upon the designation of some as "transitional" when they are special service and lack a balance of Negro, Puerto Rican, and "other" enrollment.

In view of the data and analysis made in this study, the following recommendations are made:

(1) This program should be continued in specifically defined elementary schools in transitional areas.

(2) Emphasis should be increased and placed on personnel and services for remedial reading.

(3) A further emphasis should be placed upon libraries, enrichment and guidance activities.

(4) Administrative assignments should be limited to those specifically designated for teacher training and support.

(5) All teachers should be fully informed about the program and involved in planning the specific services to be placed in each school.

(6) Parents and community people should be fully informed and made aware of the program from the inception of planning. Involvement with faculties in planning is emphasized and recommended.

5. CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NONPUBLIC REGULAR DAY SCHOOLS

THE PROJECT

The Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Regular Day Schools project consisted of the assignment of corrective reading teachers and the allocation of equipment to nonpublic schools serving disadvantaged children. Children in grades 1-4 with reading retardation of one year or more and children in grades 5-8 retarded two or more years in reading were assigned to approximately two hours per week of special instruction. The corrective reading teachers were responsible for diagnosing individual reading problems and for conducting instruction in small groups, usually of about ten children.

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation of the project had three major objectives:

1. To ascertain the degree of which the program was implemented.
2. To assess the effect of the program on the pupils.
3. To assess the reactions of the corrective reading teachers to the project.

Procedures

1. Interviews are conducted with participating administrators, corrective reading teachers, classroom teachers, and principals in participating schools. Observations were made in corrective classes.
2. Questionnaires were administered to corrective reading teachers, principals, and teachers.
3. The records kept by corrective reading teachers, which included informal test scores and scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test of Reading were examined.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Implementation

Corrective teachers were assigned to 171 schools. An examination of a sample of teachers' progress reports revealed that for individual children the mean number of hours of instruction was approximately 40 hours.

Based on sample data, the corrective reading teachers were available for an average of 48 hours of instruction throughout the project, with the range of their availability extending from 34 to 57 hours. The total number of teachers involved was 123. Generally each teacher worked in two different schools; most schools received the services of a teacher every day of the week.

A variety of standard reading curricular materials was specified for use in the project. According to teachers' estimates, approximately half the materials were available by October 17, but not until April 15 did more than half the teachers receive all or almost all the materials. Not all the available materials were found useful by all the teachers; about 40 per cent of the responding sample reported that 60-80 per cent of the materials were useful. Classroom observations and interviews indicated that this was a somewhat high estimate.

B. Teachers' Reactions

Approximately 90 per cent of the corrective reading teachers were recruited from among the graduates of the "Intensive Teacher Training Program" (ITTP), and had little or no prior experience in teaching.

The Corrective Reading program provided its teaching staff with workshops, study guides, demonstrations, supervision, etc. In rating the various aspects of this training program, these teachers reported that demonstrations by supervisors and consultants, critiques by their supervisors, and informal chats with their colleagues were most useful to them. The preponderant number of principals and classroom teachers was well-trained, capable, and cooperative.

Evaluation staff observers reported a wide range of teaching performance, from poor to excellent and from sophistication to ignorance in the teaching of reading and related problems.

On the basis of the evaluation, it is concluded that the project was generally adequately implemented; the results of pupil achievement are inconclusive; and a corps of inexperienced teachers who received training as corrective reading teachers as part of the program, were judged to be well trained by principals and teachers in the participating schools.

C. Effect on Pupils

In assessing the characteristics of the pupils served, a sample of teachers responding to a questionnaire indicated that 35 per cent of the pupils were "generally slow learners," 41 per cent were "children from impoverished home backgrounds poorly prepared for school," 2 per cent were "children with physical handicaps not previously diagnosed," 1 per cent were "children with physical handicaps affecting reading despite ongoing medical attention," 20 per cent were "non-native children having difficulties with English, 16 per cent were "native children having difficulties with standard English," and 21 per cent were "pupils with previously inadequate reading instruction."

Corrective reading teachers, principals, and teachers were asked to estimate whether there was improvement in reading skills among most, many, or few students. About half the respondents agreed that the improvement was moderate.

Agreement among the groups was less marked as to whether there was improvement in "participation in learning activities," "increase in attention span," and "general improvement in behavior." The most significant finding was that 60 per cent of classroom teachers reported that many students exhibited increased attention spans, and 39 per cent of the teachers rated the improvement as moderate.

6. BUS TRANSPORTATION TO PLACES OF CIVIC AND CULTURAL INTEREST IN NEW YORK CITY FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS 1966-67

Project Description by Board of Education

This project was intended to provide enrichment experiences by means of bus trips for disadvantaged children in grades 3 to 8 in non-public schools. This is the first year of operation of such a program in the non-public schools. Trips during the regular school day were held between January and June. The Board of Education furnished busses and sent periodic bulletins to the schools giving information on sites and on planning of trips. All necessary arrangements, such as reservations, lunch, parking, and admission fees, were the responsibility of the school.

The project description listed 204 schools with approximately 67,000 eligible children. With children 3 to a seat, each bus had a capacity of 54 children and 4 adults; busses were allotted on this basis, with provision for 3 trips per pupil in each school. The maximum duration of each trip was 5 hours, since the busses were used to transport public school children at other times.

Evaluation Methods

Observers accompanied selected trips from the time the bus left the school until it returned. The observations were fairly evenly spread over grades 3 to 8, and were chosen by religious denomination, so that they represented the total population of schools involved. This evaluation is based on data from the total of 39 observations involving 28 different schools. (Eleven schools had two busses apiece.)

There were four instruments used in the evaluation. The observer's form provided for descriptions of events and for interviews with children at each of three periods: from school to trip site, at the trip site, and on the return from site to school. Two separate questionnaires secured comments from the teacher in charge of the bus and from the school principal. In addition, a followup questionnaire to the teacher in charge of the bus was sent to schools observed early in the series.

Findings

Almost all the 39 observed trips involved intact classes; the teacher in charge of the bus was taking her own class to a site she had selected. This means that in general the teacher had the opportunity to orient her students in advance as to the educational value of the trip and to make class use of the experience after the trip.

The number of children on the observed trips ranged from 29 to 53. It should be pointed out that many Catholic schools have single classes of 40 to 50 or more children, and almost half the observed trips involved intact classes of this size. The observers commented that for older children, placing three to a seat made for crowded conditions; therefore, taking grade level into account, the bus capacity was fairly fully utilized.

In general, the observed trips went smoothly in terms of discipline. They lasted 4 to 5 hours, except for the Hebrew schools, where the duration was about 2 hours. Some schools traveled fairly great distances, for example, from Brooklyn to the Bronx Zoo, or from Queens to the Statue of Liberty.

Observers recorded the topics of the children's spontaneous conversations on the bus going to and from the site. Children made more references to the site during the return trip; this was especially true of the older children. Most of the children were interested in the chosen site, as shown by the observers' comments and by a tally of the number of questions children asked at the site. Interviews with the children showed that they did learn something from the trips; details of these interviews are included in the full report.

On most of the trips there was at least one adult (parent or teacher) in addition to the teacher in charge and the observer; however, one-fifth of the trips had no additional adult. Board of Education announcements had indicated that adult supervision was the school's responsibility. The number of necessary adults depended on the site. At some sites a tour guide would take no more than 10 children, who had to be accompanied by an adult. Some schools were simply not aware of such requirements, or of the possible desirability of having more adults along. This, no doubt, reflects the inexperience of these schools in the planning of trips. Other instances of the effects of inexperience could be cited, but it is also quite clear from the teachers' and principals' comments that as a result of these initial experiences they now know much more about how to do planning, preparation, and followup. For example, in response to a question as to how the educational value of these trips could be increased, many teachers and principals mentioned securing literature in advance from the site, and using class discussions and written reports by the children for preparation and followup.

Almost all teachers enjoyed the trip, said the children enjoyed it, considered the trip valuable, and were able to make some specific statement about how they could relate the trip to the curriculum of their class. Teachers tended to state the educational purposes of their trips in rather general terms for younger children and in more specific terms for older children. The choice of sites in general seemed appropriate to the grade level. Sites visited by younger children included the Zoo, the Aquarium, and the Statue of Liberty; Lincoln Center and the United Nations seemed better suited to the older children.

Principals reported that parents were cooperative and that their reactions to the program were positive. They also reported positive responses from the teachers in their schools. In about half the 28 schools the principal took an active interest in trip planning or assigned this responsibility to a deputy; in the other half the initiative was left to the classroom teacher.

Principals were enthusiastic about the program; without exception they wanted the program to be continued or expanded. When asked for their criticisms and suggestions, two-thirds of the teachers and over half the principals had no criticisms or suggestions for change. Some suggestions that were made involve practical limitations; for example, they requested more busses, which would require more money. The one other frequent request was for more time per trip; but under the prevailing contract arrangements the busses are not available for more than 5 hours. Schools were permitted to cancel a bus trip up to 4 P.M. of the day preceding a trip, and Board of Education bulletins had recommended planning for alternative sites in case of bad weather. Judging from the teachers' comments, this recommendation clearly needs reiteration and emphasis.

The main recommendation that emerges from these results is that each school should centralize the responsibility for the screening of trip requests and the checking of planning and arrangements in one person, whether that be the principal or an assigned deputy. This person could insure that proper consideration is given to all the details that contribute to the efficient operation of a trip. Since there is bound to be turnover in school personnel, such a person could also be helpful in orienting new staff to the planning of trips.

7. T.V. AND A.V. EVALUATION

Project Description:

A program designed to insure effective utilization of the audio visual (AV) resources -- including television -- provided under Title I and Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was conducted in 180 non-public schools for more than 250 Board of Education personnel in the fields of corrective math, corrective reading, and speech therapy. While AV modes of stimulation are attractive to children in general, this program was concerned with pupils who are retarded in the basic areas of math, reading, and speech.

The training consisted of a series of two-day sessions during the month of March 1967. During that time, intensive instruction was provided by licensed Board of Education personnel from the Board's Bureau of AV Instruction. The participants received supportive materials, saw demonstrations on the use and maintenance of machines, and learned to apply AV resources to their specific subject area. On the broadest level, it was hoped that use of AV resources would initiate greater interest and motivation toward school on the part of the child.

Evaluation Design:

It is difficult to conclude definitively whether or not all the desired goals were achieved. Because of limits of time and personnel, it was not possible to do a before and after study. Instead, the evaluation was based on questionnaires sent to all participants for their observations, on interviews with the program's coordinators, and on the records of the Board of Education.

Findings and Recommendations:

As a program in its first year, the TV - AV Teacher Training has successfully completed its trial run. There were problems of administration and organization, as could be expected, but these did not impose any insurmountable barriers. Although the program was held late in the school year, the responses of the participants were generally favorable. Almost 85 percent of them responded to this effect, and 75 percent felt the program better qualified them for their work.

For the future it is recommended that:

(1) Training sessions should be held earlier in the school year;

(2) There should be separate sessions for those who have never used the equipment, and those who have some experience in the field;

(3) After the sessions devoted to the mechanics of the equipment, the specific subject specialist should be involved in order to enrich the understanding of the professional use of the media;

(4) More follow-up activities should be employed, such as prepared visuals and prepared lists or bibliographies of available TV - AV resource material.

Prepared in the

Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs

Jacob Landers, Assistant Superintendent

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Alfred A. Giardino
President

Mrs. Rose Shapiro
Vice-President

Joseph G. Barkan
Aaron Brown
Thomas C. Burke
Lloyd K. Garrison
Morris Iushewitz
John H. Lotz
Clarence Senior

*

Dr. Bernard E. Donovan
Superintendent of Schools